

The Department of State

bulletin

THE LIBERTY BELL—SYMBOL OF FREEDOM •

Address by the President 385

THE SHIELD OF FAITH • Address by Secretary Acheson 399

BUILDING ECONOMIC STRENGTH • by Under Secretary Webb 412

UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTION TO IMPROVEMENT OF WORLD HEALTH • by Assistant Secretary Harp 428

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE UNITED NATIONS • Article by Lincoln Paulson, Springfield 504

Vol. XXIII, No. 594

November 26, 1950



For complete contents see back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXIII, No. 594 • PUBLICATION 4017

November 20, 1950

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$6, foreign \$8.50
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (July 29, 1949).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

The Shield of Faith

Address by Secretary Acheson¹

In the complex field of foreign affairs—I hope you will not think it is a vocational exaggeration to describe it as complex—it is very easy to allow ourselves to become preoccupied with one aspect or another of the problems that beset us.

It is all too simple for us to fall into a habit of viewing our foreign relations as a succession of crises, each one momentarily all-absorbing.

We have, as a nation, come but recently into our role of leadership in the world. Because our experience in this role is very brief, the perspective from which we view the problems it imposes on us is sometimes foreshortened in history. It is difficult for us to resist the temptation to let each critical aspect of our foreign affairs become in turn the central continent on our map of the world.

But although it is difficult, it is also essential that we avoid this disconnected and high-keyed approach to our responsibilities in the world.

It is necessary that we keep always before ourselves a sense of the “wholeness” of our relations with the rest of the world, if those relations are to be what we wish them to be.

Matthew Arnold, in praise of Sophocles, wrote that he “saw life steadily and saw it whole.” This precept, I think, applies with special force to that part of life which we call foreign affairs.

In one sense, to speak of the “wholeness” of our foreign relations calls to mind the fact that it involves, not just the formal acts of a few government officials, but a total contact between peoples.

The impact which our country has upon the people of the world is made up of many elements—the things which people say in this country, which, for better or for worse, are carried abroad by press or radio; the impressions which our people traveling abroad leave behind them; the experiences of visitors to this country.

Organizations like your own, whose membership crosses national boundaries, are important strands in this fabric.

Indeed, in a democracy, our foreign relations grow out of, and are expressive of, our entire national life. They reflect our total culture. They operate within the context set by public opinion. They are affected by things which we used to think of as purely domestic.

This is one sense in which we can speak of the “wholeness” of our foreign relations.

But it is of another approach to this quality of “wholeness” that I should like to speak tonight.

If we are successfully to fulfill the responsibility of leadership in the world, it is essential that we, as a people, shall achieve a union of our moral purpose and our physical power.

It is only by a fusion of these two elements within ourselves that we shall have the integrity, as a nation, to give leadership to the people of the world.

We have been obliged, of late, to concern ourselves with the urgent problem of building military and economic strength in order to meet a great danger.

This effort has led some among us to accept the view that the ultimate reality in international relations is to be found only in terms of power, whether military or economic.

This is wrong. It leaves out of account the powerful intangibles which are an essential part of the reality of international relations. Foremost among these is the moral and spiritual factor in human life.

All but those who hold the most mechanical view of human nature must agree that the moral and spiritual ideal is a powerful motivation in international life, as it is in individual man.

It is possible that we have tended to undervalue the extent to which a sense of moral purpose has guided and inspired our own actions in the world, because we have been to a great degree inarticulate about our moral values.

¹ Made before the World Organization for Brotherhood of the National Conference of Christians and Jews at Washington, D.C., on Nov. 9 and released to the press on the same date.

Indeed, many in this country have been concerned about the problem of why communism has been able to set forth a neat package of its beliefs, whereas democracy seems to have such a hard time explaining what it is about.

In their efforts to give the democratic faith a more dynamic impact upon the people of the world, many have sought a credo, an ideology, that would be expressive of democracy in a more simple form.

But it may be that the democratic faith is one of those things of which Justice Holmes said that they are better imparted by contagion than by argument.

The difficulty of finding an adequate democratic ideology may indeed be, as suggested recently in an excellent editorial in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, a difficulty inherent in democracy itself.

For democracy has no dogma, no orthodoxy. Its genius lies in the diversity which it encompasses.

When we speak of the moral purpose, or the democratic ideal, which underlies our actions in the world, we do not mean to suggest that it is part of our purpose to export our own form of government everywhere in the world. We must have the humility to understand that democracy as we know it, with the particular political and economic relationships we have come to associate with it, is not the only form a free society may take.

But what we do believe to be universal in democracy is its conception of man's proper relationship to his fellow men—the essential worth of the individual, the freedom that is essential to his growth, and the conception that men shall be brothers unto each other.

This is the nub of it—the minimum upon which all who would call themselves democratic must agree.

For this is the very heart of democracy.

Now, it is not enough that we shall have an occasional oratorical awareness of this moral conception which underlies our conduct in the world. These aspirations and purposes are not ornamental pieces, kept in the Sunday parlor, and dusted off only for such special occasions as the debates at Lake Success, or broadcasts over the Voice of America.

Our moral purpose is an essential part of the "wholeness" of our foreign relations which cannot be left aside. It must permeate all that we do. It must be always in our minds in order that the means we employ may never lead us away from the direction in which we wish to go.

I should like to put this as concretely as possible by referring to several principal aspects of our foreign policy program.

One of the major tasks before the free nations is that we shall build our military strength quickly enough, and substantially enough, to protect ourselves against the possibility of aggression.

The threat is a grave one. The consequence of

an inadequate response to it may easily be catastrophic.

But in responding to this threat, we must never allow ourselves to forget the purpose of our efforts to build our military strength.

Unless we have a constant awareness that our purpose is to maintain the peace so that the democratic values we cherish may continue their fruition, we run the risk of allowing power to become an end in itself.

We also run the risk of allowing ourselves to respond to this threat in ways which are self-defeating. It is only among those who have lost their sense of proportion about the purpose for which we need to build our military strength that talk of preventive war is possible. Only among these who have lost sight of our goals can there seem to be wisdom in self-destructive hysteria.

It is also clear that strength—even military strength—is not to be measured by a mere calculus of numbers of divisions, of tanks, and of weapons.

The vital adjunct of the strength of free societies lies in the consciousness of high purpose which free men carry with them. We have seen that the superficial strength of highly organized, totalitarian societies is brittle in adversity but that free societies have resilience even in temporary defeat.

This durability arises out of the bond of brotherhood which unites free men. In the times in which we live, brotherhood among free men has become an indispensable condition for the survival of free society.

But this moral conception is not by itself an automatic guarantee of survival. It has to be backed with a very great effort.

To build our strength so that the things we believe in can survive is the practical and vitally necessary expression in our times of our moral dedication.

We cannot afford to neglect either half of the prescription to "put our faith in the Lord and keep our powder dry."

It is equally important that, in the sphere of our activities abroad which we think of as "material," we shall have an ever-present consciousness of our moral values and sense of purpose.

In the economic field, the twentieth century has presented us with a remarkable challenge, and a phenomenal opportunity.

The outstanding fact of the twentieth century has been the great increase in productivity which has been taking place. In the advanced industrial nations, there has been a tremendous upsurge of invention and discovery, of leaps in the techniques of production.

In our own country, industrial capacity has been growing at the rate of at least three percent a year. Each year, the productivity of the individual worker in factories and on farms grows at an increasing rate.

Various philosophies interpret this great ad-

vance in different ways. There are some who approach these material advances in purely mechanical terms, without regard for human values.

History, according to this view, is written by the shifting power of groups or classes within nations, and the shifting power of nations in the international scene.

But we do not accept this view of history.

Our approach to these great material advances is moulded by a sense of our moral responsibility. It is guided and infused by an awareness of moral purpose and our conception of brotherhood, so that we may move toward a deepening and an enlargement of the sense of community in the world.

This is the essence of our difference with materialistic philosophies. Our free society affirms that moral values have validity and reality, and must be counted among the shaping influences in human history.

But this affirmation must be made through our actions.

One of the great creative functions of the United Nations is that it helps us to do exactly that, to keep the moral significance and purpose of material things always before us.

It does this in several ways.

First of all, the United Nations makes us aware, in vivid and personal terms, of the human needs of our fellow-men in other parts of the world. Technology has made neighbors of us all, and through the United Nations, our consciences are confronted with the incongruity of starvation, disease, poverty, and underdevelopment in this twentieth century.

And secondly, the United Nations provides a means for dealing with these human needs. Here, on a governmental level, are instruments at hand for sharing experience, for exchanging services, for cooperative efforts.

By dealing with these human wants as a matter of common responsibility, and not as a matter of largesse, we are moving toward an expanding sense of community among free men.

We have long accepted these common obligations toward our fellow men as part of our local community life. More recently, we have come to accept these responsibilities as part of our national community life. The acceptance of these responsibilities in a wider sphere is part of the process of growth toward an international sense of community.

Thus, through the United Nations, we are beginning to find that, in so far as the idea of brotherhood guides our efforts in the material realm, we are moving in the direction of the goals we wish to achieve in the world.

Now, so far, I have spoken of the need for keeping our moral purposes clearly in mind in carrying

out the military and material aspects of our foreign policy.

But the problem of "wholeness," of achieving a union of our moral purpose and our physical power, does not operate only in this one direction.

It also requires that the moral influences in our society must be infused with a sense of responsibility toward our exercise of power.

Instead of a wholeness, we get a fragmentation, if those who have a keen sense of our moral obligations do not also think responsibly—that is, if they do not confront themselves with the actual conditions with which we must deal in the world, if they do not begin with the actual, available alternatives from which choices must be made.

Moral guidance is not effective if it directs itself to ideal, but unavailable, solutions.

Morality, if it is not to be divorced from the practical world of action, must inform itself and relate itself to things as they are. The exercise of responsibility involves making real choices in a real world, which rarely affords the luxury of ideal conditions.

As Reinhold Niebuhr expressed it recently—

There is always an element of moral ambiguity in historic responsibilities.

To face up to this and to bring our moral idealism and our physical power into the same plane of focus is part of the problem of achieving a "wholeness." It is part of the problem of learning to bear our leadership responsibilities maturely. It is, in fact, part of the critical problem of our survival as a free people.

For it is true, as Dr. Niebuhr went on to observe, that—

... our survival as a civilization depends upon our ability to do what seems right from day to day without the distractions of alternate moments of illusion and despair.

We have, in our society, great reserves of spiritual strength from which to draw courage for the tasks ahead.

The familiar words of Paul can be a stirring inspiration to us:

Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.

Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness;

And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace.

Above all, taking the shield of faith wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.

In these ancient words of truth and inspiration, we may find the "wholeness" we seek.

The shield of our faith is inscribed with the brotherhood of man, and with the help of God, we shall direct our endeavors to this end.

The Liberty Bell—Symbol of Freedom

Address by the President¹

I am glad to be with you today, and to join in accepting this Liberty Bell.

This bell comes to the people of Independence as a gift from the people of Annecy, France. Annecy is a city in eastern France, near the Alps. It is not far from the Vosges Mountains, where the 129th Field Artillery—in which I had the honor of serving—fought in the First World War, and where a good many American boys fought in the Second World War. In both those wars, the people of the United States and the people of France fought on the same side—on the side of freedom.

Today, the people of France and the people of the United States are still on the same side—the side of freedom.

The freedom we believe in is symbolized by this bell.

This bell is an exact replica of the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall in Philadelphia.

When the Liberty Bell rang out in Philadelphia in 1776, the men who heard it had just pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to the cause of freedom. They were willing to fight for the right to live as free men. They were not afraid to stand up to tyrants and say: we are going to govern ourselves.

The spirit of the American Revolution has guided this Nation ever since 1776. We have continued to work—and to fight when necessary—for the revolutionary principles of human freedom and political equality.

Those principles are the hope of the world today. Men, all over the world, are eagerly striving for freedom and the right to govern themselves. And, we in the United States, are strongly supporting them—because that is the way to peace.

Other nations, too, have fought for freedom. A few years after our own revolution, the French Revolution was fought to overthrow a tyrant and establish a government of the people.

Today, France and many other free nations are joined with us to work for peace based on freedom and justice.

Free Nations Uniting

Today, the nations and peoples who believe in freedom face a bitter enemy. We are confronted by Communist imperialism—a reactionary movement that despises liberty and is the mortal foe of personal freedom. The threat of Communist aggression is a continuing menace to world peace.

We are meeting that threat in the only way it can be met—by building up the combined strength of the free world. The free nations must stand together and help one another, if freedom is to survive.

Our objective is to achieve a peace based on agreement among nations. This is what the United Nations is working for.

The United States stands today, and always has stood, for the settlement of differences among nations by peaceful means. I am convinced that most of the other countries in the world stand for the same thing.

But there are some nations in the world who have not been willing to have it that way. The leaders of Communist imperialism have chosen to follow the path of aggression. Through threats and through the use of force, they are seeking to impose their will upon peoples all over the world.

So long as they persist in that course, the free nations have but one choice if they are to remain free. They must oppose strength with strength.

The free nations are doing this. They are joining together to build up common defenses against the menace of Communist aggression. This work is going forward on many fronts.

The determination of the free nations to pool their strength against aggression has been shown in Korea.

Korea is proof that freedom can survive if the peoples who cherish it stand together. The com-

¹ Made at Independence, Mo., on Nov. 6, and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

mon victory against aggression in Korea is evidence that the free nations will not let Communist imperialism swallow up free peoples, one by one.

But the common defense of the free nations is more than a military matter. It is also a matter of building up economic strength and upholding spiritual values.

Strength of a Free World

This is the true basis of the strength of the free world. Men who know freedom in their daily lives are willing to work for it and fight for it.

A free country is one in which people control the government in the interest of a better life for all. In the words of the Declaration of Independence, it is a country in which government seeks to secure for its citizens "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Freedom has never been an abstract idea to us, here in the United States. It is real and concrete. It means not only political and civil rights; it means much more. It means a society in which each man has a fair chance. It means an opportunity to do useful work. It means the right to an education. It means protection against economic hazards.

We have done a lot in this country in the last few years to give new meaning to this concept of freedom.

We have put our agriculture on a stable basis, so that farm life is no longer a desperate struggle to produce more and more crops for less and less money.

We have brought a new element of democracy into our industrial life through collective bargaining.

We have established a basic security against unemployment and old age.

We have preserved and developed our natural resources for the benefit of all.

These things have given meaning—a down-to-earth meaning—to our concept of freedom.

There are some people who will tell you that freedom is endangered by farm programs, or by the public development of natural resources, or by social security. Those people are wrong. Such things bring justice and opportunity into our economic life. They are the reason why our country is stronger and more prosperous today than it has ever been before in our history.

Importance of Voting

If our people are healthy, well-educated, energetic, and confident of the future, our country will be able to accomplish the great tasks ahead of it. So long as the people of the United States know and understand freedom in their daily lives, our ability to defend it at home and throughout the world will never weaken.

If we are to enjoy and defend our freedom at home, we must exercise our right to vote. No

democracy will long remain effective if its citizens do not take an active part in government. Our country is no exception.

And yet, in the last 50 years, there has been a steady drop in the percentage of eligible voters in the United States who go to the polls and vote on election day. It is a disturbing thing that only about one out of three eligible voters took the trouble to vote in the last midterm election in 1946.

Our friends who sent us the Liberty Bell today, the people of France, know how important it is to vote. In the last general election, nearly 80 percent of the eligible voters of France went to the polls.

Voting is not only a right; it is a duty—a serious patriotic duty. I hope that every eligible voter in the United States will go to the polls tomorrow, and make certain that his family and his neighbors go to the polls, too.

We in our generation must not slip backward in our devotion to liberty.

Religious Significance of the Bell

Written around the crown of this bell are the words,

Proclaim liberty throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof.

Those words are some 2,500 years old. They come from the Bible. They reflect a deep belief in freedom under God and justice among men—a belief which is at the heart of what the Bible teaches us.

Our concept of freedom has deep religious roots. We come under a divine command to be concerned about the welfare of our neighbors, and to help one another. For all men are the servants of God, and no one has the right to mistreat his fellow men.

This concept of freedom is enshrined in our own revolution and in our Government. We are trying to live up to it today, at home and in our dealings with other nations.

We have given of our resources and our aid, in this time of stress and peril, to other nations who believe in freedom as we do. This aid is given to help these nations grow strong in freedom and to advance our common ideals. Some of this aid has gone to France—and to the people of Annecy, who made this bell.

And they, the people of Annecy, have given this Liberty Bell to us as a symbol of the great fellowship of freedom.

The fellowship of freedom is growing. It stands firm against the false prophets of communism, who represent not brotherhood, but dictatorship—not progress, but reaction.

The fellowship of freedom will prevail against tyranny, and bring peace, and justice to the world. For freedom is the true destiny of man.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE UNITED NATIONS¹

by Lincoln Palmer Bloomfield

The United Nations at the time of this writing has emerged from a period of uncertainty, engendered by the Soviet boycotts beginning in January 1950, into blazing prominence as a fast-acting agency for suppressing armed aggression. Many of the questions raised during the first four years of its existence concerning its vitality and effectiveness as the center of a collective security system have now been dramatically answered. Its forms have altered with experience, and, by analogy to our Constitution, its action in response to the armed invasion of the Republic of Korea constitutes a precedent which may rank with Chief Justice Marshall's most momentous decisions. Whatever new directions the organization and its Charter may take in response to the dynamics of the world society they represent, it is indisputable that this new parliamentary form of conducting international affairs has conclusively proved its worth and its indispensability to the future of the international community.

The job ahead for loyal members of the United Nations remains as it was when the Charter was signed in June of 1945: to labor unceasingly and in good faith to make it work. As a leading participant in the work of the United Nations, the task imposed upon the United States is a heavy one. The election to cast aside our traditional disinclination to "entanglement" and to commit ourselves to wholehearted cooperation with other nations was a momentous one for this country and,

once made, required major action to carry out and sustain.

The task of participation in international organizations has certain characteristics which are unique in our traditional setting and which illuminate the dimensions of the effort required.

The nature of the organizations concerned is multilateral. Traditionally international relations were, and to a considerable extent still are, conducted bilaterally; in the United Nations, we are one of 60 members, and must be prepared to deal with issues and cast our votes, as one of 60. We must also deal with a form of international life relatively new to us: the international secretariats.

The nature of the subject matter covered is comprehensive. The political problems and the economic problems touch every geographic area and region. The United Nations technical assistance program, now underway on a modest scale, gives promise of going to the root of economic distress and tension-breeding poverty in underdeveloped areas in all quarters of the globe. The social problems range from the feeding of children and the suppression of the traffic in narcotic drugs to the development and recognition of fundamental human rights. There are problems of transportation, of housing, of timber, coal, steel, of law, of medicine, of agricultural methods, of atomic energy, of telecommunications, of postal rates, of boundaries, of traffic in women and children, of armaments, of copyright laws—in short, of the gamut of the world's activity.

The problem of organization to conduct our participation is, consequently, one demanding an unprecedented degree of teamwork and coordination.

¹ With the exception of minor revisions to bring the material up to date as of Oct. 30, this article is reprinted from *International Organization*, World Peace Foundation, vol. iv, no. 3, p. 400.

The objective of the participation process is, of course, to forward this nation's role and interests in a fundamentally indivisible world. The corollary of this is that, through cooperation with other nations, we work toward our goals of peace, security, freedom, and a better life for men and women. In organizing ourselves and disciplining our government machinery to play our part in this process, we have an immediate and practical twofold objective: To insure that the Government speaks with one voice on issues arising in the international forums; and to insure that this voice represents the best-considered judgment and skill that this Government can bring to bear on a problem of foreign policy. At all of the meetings of the United Nations organs and subsidiary bodies and specialized agencies a United States representative must be prepared to arise and speak for his Government on the matter at issue. This fact alone serves to explain why the structure must be pyramidal—that is, a broad base for the purpose of securing as many points of view as possible, exchanging ideas and information, and hammering out final policy recommendations; a system of screening, reviewing, and channeling to secure responsible approval of the tentative policies and, where necessary, reconciliation with positions taken in other situations; and, finally, a point of departure at which the official sanction of the Government can be granted so that the representative at the other end of the line may be assured that he speaks with fullest authority.

I

The process of participation involves a number of steps. It is, in the first instance, authorized by the Congress. The Fulbright and Connally resolutions were passed in 1943, and the Senate ratified the United Nations Charter on July 28, 1945. The United Nations Participation Act, passed by the 79th and amended by the 81st Congress, is the legislative mandate under which the Department of State operates in this field, and there is enabling legislation on the books for our participation in the specialized agencies of the United Nations. In addition, the United Nations Headquarters Agreement, the Vandenberg resolution, the Headquarters loan legislation, and the appropriations of funds for operation of the Department, the United States Mission to the United Nations, and the United States delegations to international conferences all over the world—these all constitute

the legislative guide-lines defining the course of American cooperation with the world community. In addition, participation in some multilateral undertakings is done under the broad authority of the President, through Executive agreements.

Policies must be developed on the multitude of issues and problems confronting the organized international community. The United Nations and its specialized agencies held 428 meetings last year with approximately 6,000 individual sessions, in the great majority of which United States representatives had to be prepared to state this Government's position. The agenda for the current session of the General Assembly contains 75 items, including the questions of Korea, united action for peace, Palestine, the former Italian colonies, Greece, appointment of a Secretary-General, international control of atomic energy, technical assistance and economic development of underdeveloped countries, freedom of information, refugees, and political, social, and educational advancement in trust territories. The Security Council still has on its agenda, in addition to the Korean case, 22 other items, including Iran, Berlin, the Egyptian question, Indonesia, the appointment of a governor for the Free Territory of Trieste, applications for United Nations membership, and the Palestine question. Eight specialized agencies have had around 90 major sessions already during 1950.

It is apparent that the primary responsibility for initiating recommendations for action on a specific subject and for following up on the action required of the United States on that subject must reside at a designated and understood point in the Government. That is the point to which, on a given topic or problem, the Government can look for the necessary authority, technical knowledge, and background. The political and territorial problems which arise in the United Nations General Assembly, Security Council, and Trusteeship Council are basically the responsibility of the Department of State. The Department of Defense has a vital interest in these issues and principally in the military and security aspects of the work looking to regulation of armaments and provision of armed forces to the United Nations. In the case of the Trusteeship Council, the Departments of the Navy and Interior have the job of actual administration of overseas territories and possessions of the United States, and their assistance is required periodically in report-

ing on our stewardship and administration of United States territories.

There are few problems of multilateral concern which do not touch the functions and interests of some agency of the Executive Branch. The work of the United Nations Economic and Social Council covers the fields of interest of many of the executive departments and agencies. The roster of its functional and regional commissions and subcommissions mirrors the same catholicity of interest and activity: Social, Statistical, Population, Human Rights, Transport and Communications, Economic Commission for Europe, for Asia and the Far East, for Latin America, Narcotics, Status of Women, Fiscal, and Economic and Employment. In addition to the Department of State, there are at least 24 other agencies of the Executive Branch of the United States Government directly concerned with United States participation in international organizations, and the international side of their work, in many instances, bears inextricably on the success of the domestic programs they are charged with operating.

To achieve the objective of presenting with a single voice United States policies which are consistent with each other and representative of the Government as a whole, the next basic element is coordination. The principal device for effective coordination of these many interests is the interdepartmental committee network on which the appropriate agencies are represented. For example, the interagency Committee on the Food and Agriculture Organization is chaired by the Department of Agriculture and includes representatives of the Departments of State, Commerce, Labor, Treasury, Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Federal Security Agency. The Non-Self-Governing Territories Subcommittee of the International Social Policy Committee is chaired by the Department of State, and has represented on it the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Agriculture, Labor, Interior, and the Federal Security Agency. The Civil Aeronautics Board furnishes the chairman of the Air Coordinating Committee, which formulates our policies in the International Civil Aviation Organization, and the Committee includes the Post Office, State, Commerce, Defense, Treasury, and Bureau of the Budget representation. The United Nations Economic Committee, a subcommittee of the Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy, is led by the State Department and has representatives from the De-

partments of Commerce, Agriculture, Labor, Treasury, Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, the Tariff Commission, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Within the Department of State, the committee method for the coordination of policy is not used as much as prior to the reorganization of the Department in 1949 owing to the clearer allocation of operating responsibilities now in effect. One committee, however, serves as the over-all formal mechanism for insuring that the broadest possible range of different departmental perspectives on United Nations matters is systematically harmonized and drawn upon. The United Nations Liaison Committee meets on an average of every 2 weeks and includes in its membership various officers of the Bureaus of United Nations Affairs, Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs, European Affairs, Far Eastern Affairs, Inter-American Affairs, the Public Affairs and Economic Affairs areas, and the Office of the Legal Adviser. Under it, "working teams"—a more informal and flexible variety of subcommittee—carry forward the day-to-day job of meshing the views of the United Nations specialists with the other specialists on the problems currently under consideration in the United Nations system. Representing the four geographic bureaus on the United Nations Liaison Committee are officers attached to their respective Assistant Secretaries as "United Nations Advisers." They furnish a central point within each geographic bureau of the department for coordination of political and area policies with those of the Bureau of the United Nations Affairs, and for the day-to-day liaison with that Bureau on United Nations matters. Within the working units of the Bureaus, there is also daily interchange among the desk officers responsible for areas and those responsible for the various cases before the United Nations.

The stage at which these labors come to light is the instruction of American delegates and representatives and their expression of the official policies and views of the United States at the meetings of international organizations. Permanent missions at the seats of the organizations represent this Government at the United Nations in New York, at the seat of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe at Geneva, and at the International Civil Aviation Organization at Montreal. United States delegations are assembled, instructed, and sent to conferences of international

bodies throughout the world, and, between sessions of major organs, there is a never-ending process of consultation and exchange of views and information with other governments on United Nations problems. This consultation takes place throughout the year among the 51 permanent delegations to the United Nations located in New York. Other exchanges are carried on by United States missions abroad with the various foreign offices. Still other talks are held by the Department of State with the foreign missions in Washington. The use of these diplomatic channels is intensified during periods prior to major conferences and reaches its peak in the months immediately preceding the annual regular session of the General Assembly.

The final step in the process is the implementation of decisions and recommendations produced by the international organizations. When an adopted resolution of the Security Council or General Assembly, or of the other organs, is transmitted to the Secretary of State by the Secretary-General, the machinery of the Executive Branch again must turn to see that proper action is taken by this country to carry out its obligations. The responsibility for action must be assigned; follow-up mechanisms must operate to insure that the action is taken; and a report must be made to the organization describing how we have fulfilled our obligation.

II

As the staff arm of the President in the foreign affairs field, the Department of State has in this field responsibilities both for policy formulation and execution, and for coordination.

Since January 15, 1944, the Office of Special Political Affairs and, subsequently, the Office of United Nations Affairs furnished the point of coordination—the clearing house—within the Department, under the Secretary and President, through which our policies and activities were channeled for expression in the United Nations. The Hoover Commission recognized the importance of fortifying this concept within the Department with respect to participation in the United Nations and in the related specialized agencies. Its recommendations called for creating five line units under five assistant secretaries, four of whom would head up regional bureaus, with the fifth to be in charge of relations with international organizations. (Subsequently, a sixth bureau, Ger-

man Affairs, was established.) It assigned to the Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs² the responsibility for the formulation of foreign policy proposals and for action, in line with approved policy, in his field. At the same time, it specified that this officer, while participating in the formulation of foreign policy, should not be an additional agent in this field but should, as far as possible, obtain his policy guidance from the other policy areas of the Department of State. It finally recommended that the Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs should handle the bulk of substantive, policy matters coming into the Department from missions at international organizations without reference to the top command of the Department.

The Task Force report on foreign affairs on which the Commission's report was based recommended that the unit under the Assistant Secretary should be the channel for instructions to and from the United States representatives and delegations at the United Nations and all other international organizations and conferences.

The Department of State, when Congress had approved the over-all plan for the reorganization of the Department, established, on October 3, 1949, the Bureau of United Nations Affairs and defined the responsibilities of the Bureau to establish its role as the official channel between the United States and international organizations of an interregional character. At the same time, certain responsibilities for "primary" policy formulation were transferred to the Bureau from other areas of the Department. These included the development of United States positions on matters of international social policy, on international refugee questions, on problems of displaced persons, on international health problems, on the international recognition and development of human rights, and on freedom of information. These were added to the Bureau's previous responsibility for policy formulation on political and security matters in international organizations and on international trusteeship and dependent area policies.

The predecessor office of the Bureau of United Nations Affairs had established a unit on international administration, which consisted of a small group of specialists in the new and rapidly growing field of international public administra-

² The Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs is John D. Hickerson.

tion. Specifically, this unit covers the development of United States policy on budgetary, financial, and administrative aspects of international organizations, as well as the many problems involved in our role as host Government to the United Nations and other international bodies located within our borders.

Also, shortly before the reorganization of the Department, the Division of International Conferences was transferred to this Bureau, which brought with it the responsibility for making recommendations on the extent and character of participation in international conferences, both of the United Nations system and other multilateral operations, as well as the preparations, organizational and administrative, for actual participation of this Government in those conferences, with responsibility for administrative servicing of United States delegations to multilateral conferences throughout their duration. In addition, the Division provides administrative support of United States delegations to United Nations and other field missions.

The Bureau remained the central point for bringing into focus the multilateral viewpoint in our foreign relations and continued to carry out its previous over-all responsibilities for planning and guiding this Government's role in the United Nations and the world community it represents, for interpreting the constitutions and charters of the international organizations, and for the organizational and jurisdictional, constitutional, and parliamentary problems which systematic collaboration of large numbers of nations has evolved.

The Bureau of United Nations Affairs is set up to deal with problems functionally in order that the same expert knowledge and interest may be applied regardless of the international organization to each particular problem that may arise. The four officers of the Bureau each share a segment of this activity.

The Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs follows the political cases and problems of international security in the United Nations Security Council and in the General Assembly, collaborating closely with the appropriate geographic "desks" in the regional bureaus on a team basis in preparing our positions for presentation to those bodies. For example, the case of Greece was placed on the Security Council agenda in 1946 and, since 1947, has been on the agenda of

the General Assembly at each of its last three regular sessions. Our positions on the Greek case which were expressed in both of those organs were prepared jointly by the Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs and the Office of Greek, Turkish, and Iranian Affairs in the Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs with the assistance of the Counselor, Legal Adviser, and others. The latter groups furnished the expert knowledge on conditions in Greece, United States policy toward Greece, the situation in the Balkans, and the personalities involved. The Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs contributed the knowledge of the political and parliamentary situation in the United Nations, the Charter provisions which might or might not be applicable, the special question of voting procedures and voting probabilities in the body itself, and the over-all requirement of consistency with other actions which this Government was taking at the time and had taken in the past over a wide range of situations in the United Nations context.

The policies, when finally approved within the Department and, where necessary, by the National Security Council and the President, are transmitted to the United States representative in the Security Council or the United States delegation to the General Assembly and expressed by the latter, in most instances with the assistance of officers from the two parts of the Department originally involved and now acting in the role of advisers "on the floor."

This example can be multiplied many times; the cases of Palestine, Iran, Korea, Italian colonies, Kashmir, Indonesia, and others. In several of these cases (Greece, Palestine, Indonesia, Kashmir, Libya), the United Nations sent to the field missions which included United States members to investigate the problem "on the ground," and the Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs served as the central "backstop" in the Department to the United States representatives and their staffs attached to the commissioners, as well as furnishing officers as advisers who accompany our representatives on these commissions. This Office also deals with the work of the Commission for Conventional Armaments under the Security Council. In this work, it cooperates with the Department of Defense, through the medium of the Executive Committee on the Regulation of Armaments, of which the State Department's "steering

member" is the Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs. It also reviews the policies developed in the regional bureaus of the Department for application in regional organizations, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Organization of American States, in order that our positions and actions in those bodies may be fully consistent with our obligations under the United Nations Charter and our actions in the United Nations.

The Office of Dependent Area Affairs is responsible for the Department's activities in the field of United Nations trusteeships, non-self-governing territories, and colonial areas generally throughout the world. In playing this role, it prepares instructions for the use of the United States representative in the Trusteeship Council and also furnishes advice to the United States Commissioners on the Caribbean Commission and the South Pacific Commission. This Office, like its political and security counterpart, works with the appropriate geographic offices in the Department on questions dealing with the particular areas and with the metropolitan powers concerned and, as noted earlier, with agencies such as the Departments of the Interior and Navy on problems of administration of United States territories.

The Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs has a complex coordinating responsibility for the development of United States policies and activities in the field of work covered by the United Nations Economic and Social Council, including its 12 functional and regional commissions, and in the major specialized agencies of the United Nations, and sees to it that the United States representatives on those bodies are adequately instructed on all agenda items for their meetings. On social problems, as indicated earlier, this Office has the job of policy formulation in collaboration with other Government agencies. On the economic side, it works as a team with the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, drawing upon the expert economic knowledge located in that area. A current example is the Technical Assistance Program, in which the Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs takes responsibility for developing policy recommendations on the major role which the United Nations system is to play in the program. Since many of the economic and social issues revolve around such basic values as standards of living, personal security, or the rights of the in-

dividual, long-term planning in cooperation with experts in agriculture, communications, health, and other fields is obviously required.

The fourth Office is that of International Administration and Conferences. This includes the Division of International Administration and the Division of International Conferences referred to earlier and provides a common roof for the work involved in assembling and instructing our delegations to international meetings and for dealing with the multitude of financial, budgetary, administrative, personnel, site, legal, and other quasi-administrative problems of the organizations themselves, as they affect United States participation.

In addition, attached to the Office of the Assistant Secretary is the Refugees and Displaced Persons Staff, which prepares policy instructions to the United States representative in the International Refugee Organization and develops United States policies on refugee problems the world over. Here again, the policies are developed after close consultation with the area experts in the regional bureaus, with the Army (on problems in occupied areas), and with the United States Displaced Persons Commission.

The manifold and diversified tasks of the Bureau are drawn together and supervised by the Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs. He reports directly to the Under Secretary and, through him, to the Secretary. His signature appears on the formal instructions which transmit to the various United States representatives the final, approved policy papers prepared by the Bureau or initially prepared elsewhere and pulled together, reconciled, and put in finished form by Offices of the Bureau. Under his direction, special briefing on policy issues under discussion is furnished to United States delegations to such major conferences as the United Nations General Assembly, as well as to newly appointed United States representatives to United Nations organs, commissions, and field missions. He is the focal point for resolution of major differences on these matters which must be ironed out at higher levels. He takes part in the Under Secretary's thrice-weekly staff meeting; he is chairman of the United Nations Liaison Committee in the Department, mentioned earlier; and he conducts relations on behalf of the Bureau with his counterparts elsewhere in the Department, in other Government agencies, and in other governments.

Relations of the Bureau with the Congress are conducted through appearance of the Assistant Secretary and other officers before hearings of Congressional Committees; through informal liaison; and through one of the eight working teams of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on different phases of Department of State activity. The group on the United Nations, chaired by the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, meets as frequently as possible with the Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs to insure a flow of information and views on problems of mutual concern.

No description of the participation process would be complete without a brief description of the "front lines"—the Mission of the United States accredited to the United Nations in New York. This Mission is headed by a Chief of Mission^{*} who is the United States representative to the United Nations with the rank of Ambassador and the formally designated United States representative to the United Nations Security Council, Atomic Energy Commission, Commission for Conventional Armaments, and the Interim Committee of the General Assembly. Under the terms of the amended United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 341, 81st Congress), the Mission also includes a Deputy United States representative to the United Nations with the rank of Ambassador, who may also represent the United States in the Security Council and, like the United States representative, may sit *ex officio* on any organ or commission of the United Nations proper. There is a deputy United States representative on the Security Council and deputy representatives on the Atomic Energy Commission, Commission for Conventional Armaments, and Interim Committee. The Mission was formally established by Executive order of the President, which specifies that, in addition to the above, it shall include in its organization the United States representatives on the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. These both have Presidentially appointed deputies who have, in practice, been the Directors of the Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs and the Office of Dependent Area Affairs, respectively. By doubling as deputy United States representatives at meetings of the two Councils, they have constituted a double link in the process of over-all coordination and

teamwork between the Department and the Mission. The United States representatives on the Military Staff Committee, one high-ranking officer from each of the three military services, are also part of the Mission although, unlike the rest of the Mission, they receive their formal instructions from the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington instead of from the Secretary of State. In practice, they operate as advisers on military questions to the Chief of Mission.

This is the top staff. Managed by a Secretary General and, under his direction, staffs to furnish administrative, fiscal, reporting, communications, personnel, and transportation services, the Mission is our "Embassy" at New York. The Public Affairs staff deals in New York regularly with about 40 news correspondents and with around 50 representatives of private nongovernmental organizations which follow closely the work of the United Nations in New York. Technically speaking, if it were London or Paris instead of New York, the "Embassy" would be the small suite in the hotel where the Chief of Mission actually lives. The "chancery" would be the busy, active suite of offices in a modern office building. This is, in fact, the Mission and the nerve center of our official United Nations activities at New York the year around.

The United States Mission provides the Department's day-to-day, in some cases, minute-to-minute, contact with the United Nations Secretariat and with the delegations of 50 other nations permanently located at the seat of the United Nations. It has the staff to sit regularly on such frequently meeting bodies as the Security Council and Interim Committee. It furnishes a base of operations for the United States delegations sent from Washington to represent the United States at meetings of the United Nations at its New York headquarters: the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and annually, the General Assembly meeting.

The Mission enjoys the same relationship with the Bureau of United Nations Affairs, as, say, the American Embassy at London has with the Bureau of European Affairs. The Bureau of United Nations Affairs is its "home desk," and on the organization charts a neat line runs down from the Bureau to the Mission, representing the normal two-way channel for instructions, communications, and information. The Chief of Mission reports to the President through the

^{*} Ambassador (former Senator) Warren R. Austin is Chief of Mission.

Secretary of State. In practice, there is a perpetual flow of formal instructions, informal memoranda, telegrams, and trained officers between the Mission and the Bureau, supplemented by three busy telephone tie-lines. The relationship is close and harmonious, and the top officers of the Mission make periodic visits to the Department to participate in the thinking and planning which will emerge, eventually, in the form of formal instructions to act. It is clearly an "instructed delegation," and, at the same time, it is the New York half of a team organized to produce the most effective results in discharging our obligations as a member of the United Nations.

To complete the picture, it is necessary to go outside the organizational walls and to recognize the overriding importance of this participation process to the individual. Membership in the United Nations and its sister organizations is meaningful only to the extent it constructively affects the lives and futures of individuals.

The United States public, through its organizations, its letters to the Department, its press and radio, and its concern with the welfare of the

cause of international cooperation, is an active participant. The Division of Public Liaison in the Department's Office of Public Affairs keeps in close touch with the organizations, the educational groups, and the media of public information. Forty-two national organizations were invited by the Secretary to serve as consultants at the San Francisco Conference. So far as participation in United Nations activities is concerned, "secret diplomacy" is obsolete. The glare of publicity is blinding, with several thousand newspaper correspondents covering a General Assembly session in Paris and 50 or 100 representatives of national citizens organizations in frequent consultation with high departmental or New York mission officials on what United States policy should be. Taken in conjunction with the stature of United States representatives to the General Assembly such as Mrs. Roosevelt, General Marshall, Warren Austin, and Senators Vandenberg and Connally, this broad base of policy formulation makes the participation of the United States in the community of nations as "total" as our national system permits.

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Germany and the Spanish Civil War, 1936-39. Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918-1945, Series D (1937-1945). Pub. 3838. 951 pp. \$3.25 a copy.

Selected documents from the captured archives of the German Foreign Ministry and Reich Chancellery with the purpose of establishing a full record of German foreign policy during the period stated above.

Loyalty and Security in the Department of State. Department and Foreign Service Series 19. Pub. 3841. 11 pp.

An explanation of the security and loyalty programs which are in effect in the Department and the procedures the Department follows in carrying them out.

Passport Visa Fees. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2084. Pub. 3917. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Portugal—Effectuated by exchange of notes signed at Lisbon February 22 and 24, 1950; entered into force February 24, 1950, operative from April 1, 1950.

Passport Visas. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2021. Pub. 3920. 3 pp. 5¢.

Arrangement between the United States and Liberia—Effectuated by exchange of notes signed at Monrovia October 27 and 28, 1947; entered into force October 28, 1947, operative December 1, 1947.

Exchange of Official Publications. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2085. Pub. 3923. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Spain—Effectuated by exchange of notes signed at Madrid May 8, 1950; entered into force May 8, 1950.

Passport Visas. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2031. Pub. 3932. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Iceland—Effectuated by exchange of notes signed at Reykjavik October 1 and December 9, 1947; entered into force December 9, 1947, operative January 1, 1948.

The Far Eastern Commission. Third Report by the Secretary General. Far Eastern Series 25. Pub. 3945. 48 pp. 20¢.

Coverage of the activities of the Commission from December 24, 1948 through June 30, 1950.

Halibut Fishing Vessels: Port Privileges on the Pacific Coasts of the United States and Canada. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2096. Pub. 3951. 5 pp. 5¢.

Convention between the United States and Canada—Signed at Ottawa March 24, 1950; proclaimed by the President of the United States August 2, 1950; entered into force July 13, 1950.

Building Economic Strength

by James E. Webb, Under Secretary of State¹

We have seen in the last few months one of the small nations of the free world threatened with complete subjugation by the forces of international communism.

We have also seen in these months the determination of the free nations, within the framework of the United Nations, to resist and throw back this unprovoked aggression. The prompt, effective, and successful action of the United Nations has given new hope and, above all, new confidence to the nations of the free world. And this new confidence is a powerful factor in restoring that economic stability which is so necessary for expanding world trade.

Let us not think for a moment, however, that the rescue of Korea from Communist conquest is an isolated example of international cooperation. On the contrary, dramatic as it may appear to be, it is the logical culmination of 5 years of patient and frequently undramatic spadework by our country and more than 50 other countries which make up the free world. In a very real sense, it is the pay-off of this 5 years of effort—an effort that has not been limited to the governments concerned. It has been shared in full measure by the peoples of these countries, and by many private organizations as well. In our country, organizations such as yours, the National Foreign Trade Council, have played a most important part. Your support, together with the support of the great majority of our citizens, has made possible the dividends on our foreign policy of which Korea is the latest symbol.

It was only 5 years ago* that almost all of Europe, the Pacific coast of Asia, the great island countries of the Pacific and Southeast Asia, lay scorched and devastated by war. In all these areas, trade and commerce had been cut off and indeed their very facilities—railways, harbors, docks, shipping—had been destroyed. Under

these conditions, with poverty, hunger, and disease the rule instead of the exception, we cannot wonder that the agents of communism made such headway.

In 1945, to sum it up, we faced the prospect of world communism fed by world chaos.

Thus, our task since the war has been twofold. It has been to rebuild a free world economy, and at the same time, to create a defensive shield behind which this rebuilding could take place unhampered by Communist aggression. Progress has been made on both parts of this task. The first part was staggering enough. It was made doubly so in that it had to be done under the constant menace of subversion or open interference. I sometimes think that during these difficult and eventful years, the spirits of our pioneer ancestors may have looked down upon us from on high with a grim but approving smile. They built their log cabins in the wilderness with an axe in one hand and a rifle in the other. We are rebuilding the world under somewhat similar circumstances.

The measures we have taken to perform our task have been political, military, and economic. Of these, the economic are, in many respects, the most important and most enduring since political freedom and military security depend upon them.

We are all familiar with the principal political and military measures. They include the organization of the United Nations, the support of Iran, the Truman doctrine, the Rio pact, the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and, of course, the present cooperation of 53 nations in Korea.

These measures have worked.

But let us picture for a moment what the situation would be if we had not taken these measures and they had not worked.

All Europe and perhaps all Asia might today be under Communist domination. We in the Western Hemisphere, and perhaps a few other free nations, would be left to oppose it unaided. And think how intolerable life would necessarily be

¹ An address made before the National Foreign Trade Council in New York on Nov. 1 and released to the press on the same date.

within our own borders. We would virtually have to convert our country into an armed camp. We should be forced to clamp down iron controls on our every material asset. We should hardly be able to choose between guns and butter—there might be no butter. We should be cut off from many of the raw materials we need for our defense—the tin and rubber of Malaya, the jute from India, the hemp from the Philippines, the oil from the Middle East, and countless other products.

Not only would we be deprived of the raw materials we need for our defense but we would also have to contemplate what it would mean to us if the sources of these raw materials and the economic power of Western Europe were in Communist hands. Next to the United States, Western Europe represents the greatest concentration of economic power in the world. The U.S.S.R., plus Eastern Europe, comes third. Western Europe has about 40 percent greater economic output and about 75 percent greater steel production than the U.S.S.R. and its satellites. If Soviet imperialism had been able to take Western Europe, it would have added to itself an economic strength greater than its own. We would live in an atmosphere of fear, privation, and regimentation without hope for a day of peace, security, or well-being.

But the defensive shield against these catastrophes is being forged. It is constantly being strengthened, and, behind it, we are building a free economy which not only can resist communism, but which, we hope, in time will win to itself additional adherents.

That, in short, is the record. That is what the political and military measures taken by us and the other free nations have accomplished thus far. It speaks for itself.

But, great as the achievement along political and military lines has been, our defensive shield would lack necessary strength if it had not been reinforced by the measures we have taken in the economic field.

Necessity for Economic Strength

Without a strong shield for our defense and the confidence it inspires, we cannot achieve economic stability and economic well-being. Without economic strength, we cannot maintain political and military strength. Without effective international cooperation, we cannot have in the free world either the political, military, or economic strength necessary to the tasks ahead.

Does this mean that we have to make fundamental changes in the foreign economic policies that we have developed since the war?

I think the answer is no. We will have to convert some of our economic power into military power. But our main objectives will be unchanged, and I think we must keep those objectives ever

more firmly in mind because of the existence of Soviet imperialism.

The theme of your meeting this week—that “the foundation of world economic development is the expanding interchange of goods and services”—is and should continue to be the touchstone by which we examine each of our economic policies.

The Marshall Plan, as we are all aware, provided that margin which enabled Western Europe to become again the world's second greatest economic grouping. Through the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and its continuously effective removal of trade barriers, we have achieved an “expanding interchange of goods and services.”

Through the European Payments Union, we are stimulating this expanding interchange by facilitating the clearing of accounts between those nations.

Under the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, the United States has taken the lead in bringing about the largest general multilateral reduction in artificial barriers to international trade that the world has ever known. This has been done under proper safeguards to American industry.

We are expanding the scope of our treaties of friendship, commerce and economic development. Besides the ones that have recently been negotiated—with Italy, Uruguay, and Ireland—negotiations are in progress with a considerable number of other countries.

Within our own Government, we must be constantly on the alert to see that we remove every possible obstacle to the expanding exchange of goods and services. Hence, it gives me great pleasure to announce that, effective today, the Treasury Department, through the Bureau of Customs, has established procedures whereby foreign traders can obtain, in advance of importation to the United States, a formal ruling of the tariff classification of merchandise and the rate of duty to be applied.

Frank Dow, the Commissioner of Customs, points out that this is one of the most important steps that the Bureau has taken in its continuing program of procedural improvements to meet modern trade needs.

Although in the past, advisory opinions have been obtainable, the new provisions will make it possible for the importer to know exactly how the merchandise he wishes to bring into the United States will be treated for tariff purposes, and thus he can tell what the “landed costs” will be. The new procedure will operate in this manner:

Prospective importers or foreign exporters may apply in writing to the Commissioner of Customs for a ruling as to the tariff classifications of an article, if they furnish the necessary information such as specifications, component materials, and chief use. A decision as to the tariff classification of the article can thus be made in advance of

its importation. And if the decision appears to be of sufficient importance to the trade, it will be published in the *Weekly Treasury Decisions* and will become a "uniform and established practice" not subject to administrative change to a higher rate without formal notice and a 30-day waiting period. I think this will stimulate foreign trade because, with greater certainty in regard to customs charges, our importers can make freer commitments.

Technical Assistance Provided

In addition to facilitating the interchange of goods and services by improved regulations, it is important to consider, as you have done this week, what we can do to speed up the economic development of relatively underdeveloped areas. Before the peoples of these areas can hope to have stable economic conditions, a tremendous amount of basic work must be done. Part of this can be accomplished through the sharing of technical assistance and measures to expand the flow of private investment funds into these areas. The Point 4 Program for providing technical assistance is now getting under way. An International Development Advisory Board of private citizens to advise and consult with the Secretary of State on matters pertaining to Point 4 is now being formed.

Not included under Point 4, but as an example of a comprehensive type of program which may be necessary in special cases, I might mention the proposals now under study by our Government and that of the Philippine Republic. These are the recommendations of the United States Economic Mission to the Philippines, which spent 2 months there this summer making a thorough study of economic problems.² President Truman sent this mission, headed by former Under Secretary of the Treasury, Daniel W. Bell, and composed of high-level technical experts, to the Philippines early in July at the request of President Quirino. Its report has just been published.

The problems that faced the young Republic when it came into being in July 1946 were appalling. Not only had the islands been devastated in a particularly cruel war but they had also been cut off from the sources from which they received the bulk of their consumer goods. In recent months, their financial and economic problems have become increasingly acute. The recommendations of the Bell Mission cover a comprehensive range that includes taxation, public finance, industrial and agricultural production, agricultural credit, agricultural extension services, land tenure, development of power projects, public health, education, construction of roads, and a wide range of technical assistance. We earnestly hope that these recommendations will form the basis for a stable Philippine economy so that the resources and

wealth of that Republic will make its important potential contribution to world trade and so that the Philippine people may be able to look forward to economic progress and an increase in their standard of living.

In considering the capital needs of the underdeveloped areas, the program of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has real significance. Its outstanding loans amount to a little over 1 billion dollars, to be exact 1 billion, 17 million dollars. Approximately 40 percent represents loans to countries which are seriously in need of economic development. Almost all of these new development loans were made within the past year, as, for example, those to Turkey, India, Iraq, and Ethiopia. Let me take a moment to discuss one of the bank's small loans. Six million dollars was loaned to Ethiopia specifically to improve feeder highways which serve the railroad system of that country. This will expedite deliveries and cut down the present inordinately high transportation costs. The end product will be more internal trade and more foreign trade.

Also the loan to the new Ethiopian Development Bank will make available the foreign exchange required to purchase improved agricultural and industrial equipment. It will provide capital to replace obsolete equipment as well as to buy the additional equipment needed to bring small factories to higher levels of efficiency.

In effect, what the bank is doing is to furnish a line of credit to the Ethiopian Development Bank whose capital stock will be subscribed in Ethiopian dollars. This credit will permit financing of many private projects, any one of which might be too small to justify bringing it separately before the International Bank. By the same token, this type of arrangement eliminates the need for a separate action by the Ethiopian Government to guarantee each project. Although small, this undertaking by the bank starts a movement which, on a wider basis, should both encourage the participation of local capital and provide foreign capital for development needs.

Since July 1, 1945, the Export-Import Bank has made loans for economic development in excess of 1 billion dollars.

More than 70 percent of this amount was for development loans to Latin America and Asiatic countries—for generation and distribution of electrical power, agricultural administration, highway construction, irrigation and flood control, and production of metals and minerals. Two hundred and twelve million dollars of this amount was loaned during the past 3 months.

As the outstanding loans of the Export-Import Bank are repaid, the funds received can be reloaned—thus automatically providing the bank with additional lending power for other suitable development projects.

² BULLETIN of Nov. 6, 1950, p. 723.

International Trade Participation

In our efforts to build economic strength and create the kind of confidence that makes for economic stability, we have found many nations willing to cooperate in expanding interchange of goods and services. Ten years ago, the United States participated in less than 25 international organizations. Today we participate in 66 such organizations.

In the field of agriculture and fisheries, we participate in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, the International Seed-Testing Association, and the International Whaling Commission.

In the commodity field, we participate in the work of the Combined Tin Committee, the International Cotton Advisory Committee, the International Sugar Council, the International Tin Study Group, the International Wheat Council, the International Wool Study Group, and the Rubber Study Group.

In the fields of economics and finance, we participate in the Interim Commission for the International Trade Organization, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property, and the International Union for the Publication of Customs Tariffs.

In the transport and communications field, we participate in the Inter-American Radio Office, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, the International Union of Official Travel Organizations, the Pan American Railway Congress Association, the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses, the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain, the Provisional Maritime Consultative Council, and the Universal Postal Union.

Business Leaders Assist Program

In fact, the work of the State Department in the fields of international economics is of great importance to every citizen, whether he is in business abroad or not. The Department maintains over 300 embassies, legations, and missions in foreign countries. The work of these missions makes a vital contribution to our efforts to create a positive, successfully functioning political, economic, and security program for the free world in cooperation with other nations. To head these missions, the President has selected the finest type of American, and I can say without hesitation that never in the history of this country have we had more able representation abroad than that provided by men like Ambassador Douglas in London, Ambassador Bruce in Paris, Commissioner McCloy in Germany, and many others. These men understand world trade. So does

another distinguished American, Norman Armour, who has just sailed from this city to take up his duties as Ambassador to Venezuela. The return to active duty from a well-earned life of retirement of this most able and experienced diplomat emphasizes again the importance which the President, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Armour himself all attach to the development of ever closer relations between the peoples of South and North America.

In closing, I want to say something of a more general, indeed of a more personal nature. In talking with you today of the decisions and policies of your Government, I may unconsciously have given the impression that they were made by officials in Washington, somehow miraculously isolated and living in a rarified atmosphere separate from the work-a-day world. That is not so. The policies of our Government are not made and cannot be made by any small group of men, no matter how able. They are your responsibility as well as ours in Washington, and they are made for better or for worse because of what you as businessmen and as citizens contribute to their making.

Our Government is not a government by a small professional class either in the Civil Service or the Foreign Service. It includes many men in key positions who have taken what our college friends call a sabbatical leave from their usual occupations.

A man to whom you are about to present a distinguished award and who has just retired to a deserved rest from the fearful strain of heading the Economic Cooperation Administration—Paul G. Hoffman—has spent his lifetime in business, not in government. His distinguished adviser—a man who has contributed tremendously to the success of the Economic Cooperation Administration—Clinton Golden—was drafted by government away from labor. In the Defense Establishment, Robert Lovett, the distinguished banker, is once again in government harness. In the Department of State, to pick only a few names that come to my mind—there are Assistant Secretary George Perkins, John Foster Dulles, Assistant Secretary George McGhee, and John O'Gara—all of whom have left their own business in order to serve their country.

But the relationship of government to business, labor, agriculture, and the professions goes vastly further than this. Government is sometimes pictured as a great octopus-like force that is somehow imposing its will upon us as citizens. I submit that this is the reverse of the truth. Our Government is constantly reaching out to ascertain what is the intelligent opinion of its citizens. That is a necessary part of government. Our foreign economic policy could not have been developed if it had not been for the interest of trained and experienced specialists like yourselves.

It is from meetings like these, and from our

countless conferences in Washington with business and labor and agriculture groups, that our foreign economic policy springs.

Five Truths for Guides

As we look to the future, there are five simple truths which must be our guide:

First: Peace for the United States cannot be separated and isolated from peace in the world as a whole. Our security and well-being now depend upon, and are completely bound up with, the security and well-being of free peoples everywhere.

Second: Peace is now constantly endangered by the direct or indirect aggression of Soviet Russia. This threat is world-wide, although its form and immediacy vary somewhat from area to area.

Third: This threat cannot be removed unless free nations increase their strength—moral, economic, political, and military—to a level which will discourage and, if necessary, repel aggression.

Fourth: No single free nation is capable, without economic suicide, of providing the full strength required to neutralize the general Soviet threat to all free people. This strength can only be provided if all nations which have an identity of interests contribute to the common strength of the whole group.

Fifth: The United States, as the wealthiest of the free nations confronted by this threat, must, for its own national security, contribute its share. This will not be small. We must face that fact. But we also must remember that, however great the cost of peace, it is only a fraction of the cost of war.

These five simple truths measure the challenge to which we of this generation must respond. If this response is to meet and turn back the aggressive tide of Communist imperialism, we must search out and find the positive, advancing, dynamic components of a forward-moving civilization. We must join with other nations and peoples to produce a world-wide social, economic, and political climate under which the energies of millions will be released and stimulated to carry on the constructive work of the world. That is why we support the United Nations as the cornerstone of our foreign policy. That is why our foreign economic policy is one of building economic strength.

Berlin Industrial Exhibition

[Released to the press October 16]

The Berlin Industrial Exhibition, which ended on October 15, proved to be an outstanding success, surpassing the expectations of the German

officials in charge. Approximately 1,100,000 visitors attended the exhibition during the 15 days following its opening on October 1. Over 400,000 of these are estimated to have come from the Russian zone.

The George C. Marshall House, which was visited by 800,000 persons, was the center of American exhibits ranging from an American library of books and periodicals to an electrically animated model of a typical American industrial community in action and a 235-seat cinema theater offering continuous showings of American industrial and documentary films to capacity audiences.

Representatives of major American labor unions and of the United States Department of Commerce had set up headquarters in the Marshall House for hundreds of conferences with German industrialists and labor leaders aimed at increasing the flow of trade between Germany and the United States. German fair officials reported that German industry had received a great boost, particularly in the fields of electrical machinery and textiles.

The Marshall House, which was built with ECA-allocated counterpart funds, will remain as a permanent exhibition and conference center in Berlin. A smaller but equally popular American exhibit was the 6-room, completely furnished model American home, including garage and connecting breezeway, which had been shipped in sections from the United States and assembled in 10 days to show how the average American wage earner and his family live. Shortly after the exhibition opened, the crowds sought admission to the small frame house in such numbers that it became necessary to place police guards at the front and rear entrances and to escort visitors through in small groups. Visitors to the model American home averaged from 3,000 to 3,500 a day, with the result that a path was worn straight across the living room rug after the first week.

The final day of the exhibition was highlighted by a giant international labor rally at the Olympic Stadium attended by 40,000 persons under the banner "the workers of the free world greet Berlin." While residents of the Soviet-sponsored East German Republic were being instructed to "march in festive spirit" to the polls to vote for a single slate of candidates, their countrymen in West Berlin and environs were voluntarily spending the Sunday holiday by the thousands at the industrial exhibition and at the labor rally to see and hear free expressions of western democracy in the Marshall Plan countries.

Gerhardt Wiemer, Berlin's veteran director of fairs and exhibits, characterized the 2 weeks of the exhibition as follows:

We have not only given the world an overwhelming demonstration of true democratic ideals, we have also demonstrated that the nations of the free world are working side by side for their mutual welfare in the field of practical cooperation.

Soviet Claims Inquiry on Prisoners of War, a Propaganda Drive

U.N. doc. A/1339/Add.1
Transmitted Oct. 27, 1950

Letter dated 27 October 1950 addressed to the Secretary-General by the United Kingdom on behalf of Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

NEW YORK, 27 October 1950

I have the honour to refer to the letter of 25 August¹ from the representatives of Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States enclosing an explanatory memorandum on the item "Failure of the U.S.S.R. to repatriate or otherwise account for prisoners of war detained in Soviet territory" which these three delegations had proposed for inclusion on the agenda of the fifth session of the General Assembly.

Annex X to that letter contained the text of a Note addressed by the British Embassy in Moscow to the Soviet Government on 14 July 1950 concerning the repatriation of German prisoners of war. I enclose with this letter a copy in translation of a Note addressed by the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the British Embassy in Moscow in reply to the Embassy's Note of 14 July, and I have the honour to request, on behalf of the three delegations who proposed the inclusion of this item on the agenda, that this Note from the Government of the U.S.S.R. may be added to the explanatory memorandum already submitted and that it may be given a similar circulation.

GLADWYN JEBB

Note Addressed by the Soviet Government to the Embassy of the United Kingdom in Moscow on 30 September 1950

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., acknowledging receipt of the British Government's note of 14 July 1950, considers it necessary to make the following statement. The assertion contained in the above-mentioned note of the British Government that a large number of German prisoners of war still remain in the Soviet Union is devoid of all foundation and does not correspond with reality. As is known from the Tass communiqué of 5 May of this year, the repatriation of German prisoners of war from the Soviet Union was completed at the beginning of 1950. All German prisoners of war in the Soviet Union were repatriated to Germany with the exception of 9,717 convicted of serious war crimes, 3,815 the question of whose war crimes is being investigated, and 14 temporarily detained owing to illness.

In view of the exhaustive facts adduced above concerning the repatriation of German prisoners of war from the Soviet Union the Soviet Govern-

ment is unable to regard the British Government's renewed communications to the Soviet Government concerning this question other than as a desire to exploit the question of German prisoners of war for propaganda purposes.

The Soviet Government is sending similar notes to the Governments of the United States and France.

Prisoner of War Day Commemorated

Statement by Secretary Acheson

[Released to the press October 25]

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has proclaimed Thursday, October 26, 1950, as Prisoner of War Commemoration Day.

The entire free world, I am certain, is indignant that, today over 5 years after the end of hostilities and years after the last prisoner of war in the custody of the United States was repatriated, the Soviet Union still retains many thousands of German and Japanese prisoners of war.

The United States, mindful of its humanitarian obligations and of its support of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, will continue to do everything in its power to obtain the release of these prisoners of war from the Soviet Union.

U.S. Attempts To Conclude U.S.S.R. Lend-Lease Program

[Released to the press November 7]

The United States Ambassador in Moscow, Admiral Alan G. Kirk, has again seen Andrei Gromyko, the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister, in an effort to obtain replies to our June 15 notes¹ to the Soviet Embassy in Washington concerning lend-lease settlement.

Mr. Gromyko, on August 4, had stated to Ambassador Kirk that replies to our notes would be forthcoming in due course. Inasmuch as replies to our notes have not yet been received, the Ambassador called on Mr. Gromyko November 3 and presented a note requesting prompt replies from the Soviet Government.

In the course of his discussion with Mr. Gromyko, Ambassador Kirk made particular reference to the delays of the Soviet Government in arranging for the return to the United States of the naval vessels demanded by the United States Government under article V of the Master Lend-Lease Agreement, the failure of the Soviet Government to compensate six United States firms for the use of their patented processes supplied to the

¹ BULLETIN of Sept. 11, 1950, p. 430.

¹ Not printed.

Soviet Government under article IV of the Master Lend-Lease Agreement and the question of an over-all settlement of the Soviet lend-lease account.

Mr. Gromyko repeated his statement of August 4 saying that our notes of June 15 were still being considered and that a comprehensive reply would be made in due course.

U.S. Stand on Soviet Proposal for Big Four Session on Germany

Statement by Secretary Acheson

[Released to the press November 8]

We are, of course, giving careful consideration, in consultation with the French and British Governments, to the Soviet proposal for a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers on demilitarization of Germany. We find it somewhat extraordinary that the Soviet Government should be so eager that this meeting be held promptly. The Soviet Government delayed, for over 5 months, its reply to our note of last May calling upon the Soviet authorities in Germany to disband the extensive and heavily armed paramilitary forces, which they have created in the Eastern zone. The belated Soviet reply completely evaded the issue.

Furthermore, I should like to point out that at the Council of Foreign Ministers in the spring of 1949 five futile weeks were devoted to discussion of Germany and no progress was made in the face of Soviet intransigence. At that same meeting, however, those essential elements of an Austrian treaty, still in dispute after 3 years of negotiation, were agreed, and it was assumed that a treaty would be concluded very shortly. Yet, during the ensuing year and a half, the U.S.S.R. has prevented the conclusion of that treaty by repeated introduction of new and irrelevant issues into the negotiations. In deciding how a further meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers could in fact serve the interests of world peace, we must clearly consider the extent to which the decisions of the previous meeting have or have not been carried out.

Finally, I should like to point out that Germany is not a problem which can be isolated from the context of similar areas of tension elsewhere. It is but one of many issues which Soviet policy, since the end of the war, has thrust upon the world. Other nations are being subjected to an increasing war of nerves and, in some cases, to actual aggression.

It is for these reasons that the free world is re-arming and mobilizing its strength and resources. It will continue to do so until these legitimate fears are removed. However, it is our most earnest desire that these fears be removed, and

we would welcome an opportunity to lessen them. If discussions are to contribute to this desired end, they must be based upon evidence of a genuine desire and intention to reach agreements which would remove or alleviate the threats to world security and not merely upon a desire to exploit for propaganda purposes the longings of all peoples for peace.

We shall reply in due course to the Soviet note but the issues involved are far too serious to admit of hasty treatment.

Mail Censorship by Soviets Violates German Constitution

[Released to the press November 10]

Residents of the Soviet zone of Germany are being subjected to yet another tyranny of the police state, that of mail censorship, despite constitutional guaranties to the contrary, according to information reaching RIAS, the American radio station in Berlin. The news was found blatantly published in the Dresden *Saechsische Zeitung*.

A recent victim of the censorship, one Frau Christa Wagner of Doebeln township in Saxony, was sentenced to 18-months imprisonment for having written a letter to RIAS, representing "the greatest enemy of the German people, American imperialism," according to the newspaper report.

The letter in question did not reach RIAS. It was confiscated by the Soviet zone People's Police, after censorship disclosed that it contained sentiments opposed to the Communist regime of Eastern Germany.

The Dresden *Saechsische Zeitung* of September 13, reporting the woman's subsequent trial by a People's Court in Freiberg, said:

While more and more residents of the German Democratic Republic cooperate in advancing our progressive development, there are still some elements who oppose it and whose conduct supports the war policy of the Anglo-American imperialists.

Only several paragraphs later does the reader learn that the article concerns Frau Wagner who was jailed for 18 months for daring to write a fan letter to RIAS.

Section B, article 8 of the Constitution of the German Democratic Republic begins:

Freedom of person, inviolability of the home, secrecy of the mails, and the right to settle in any chosen place are guaranteed.

The foregoing is believed to be the first open confirmation of recent unofficial reports that Communist authorities have established a blanket mail censorship system throughout Eastern Germany and the Soviet sector of Berlin.

Protest Delivered to U.S.S.R. for Interference in Austria

[Released to the press November 11]

The following is the text of a note delivered by the American Ambassador at Moscow on November 10 to the Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. protesting Soviet interference with the Austrian Government.

The Ambassador of the United States of America presents his compliments to the Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs [Andrei Gromyko] of the U.S.S.R. and has the honor to invite the Acting Minister's attention to the discussions which took place in the Allied Council in Austria on October 13, 1950, during which the Soviet representative maintained the untenable point of view that mob violence in the Soviet zone of Austria is not properly the concern of the Allied Council and that actions taken by a local Soviet commander may not be discussed by the Council. This assertion cannot, of course, be accepted by the Government of the United States since the control agreement for Austria of June 28, 1946, makes it clear that the Allied Council may and should concern itself with any matter relating to the maintenance of law and order and with any derogation of authority guaranteed by agreement to the Austrian Government.

The Soviet Government must be fully aware of the incidents which gave rise to the statement of the Soviet representative in the Allied Council, the more so since he, himself, at no time denied that they had occurred. However, for convenience, they are briefly recapitulated below:

In the course of demonstrations in the Soviet zone of Austria on October 4 and 5, 1950, the Soviet commander in the city of Wiener Neustadt obstructed efforts of the Austrian police to restore general order and ordered the police to return the federal post office to the control of the lawless mob, which had been ejected by the police, after it had illegally occupied the building. Further, this Soviet commander ordered the withdrawal of the police sent to Wiener Neustadt by the recognized Austrian authorities to maintain order and to protect life and property from the rioters. In taking these measures, the Soviet commander threatened that the Soviet armed forces would act against the Austrian police should they fail to comply with his orders.

The law enforcement activities of the Austrian Government have been further hampered by the Soviet officer who commanded the president of the Vienna police immediately to recall to the Soviet sector any police forces employed outside that sector, not to execute the orders for dismissal and transfer of Austrian police officials without the consent of the Soviet element of the Interallied Command, and to forbid the employment of police forces of the Soviet sector of Vienna in any other sector.

As stated above, the Allied Council, by its terms of reference, clearly is called upon to concern itself with the maintenance of law and order in Austria. Thus, article 3 D of the control agreement requires the Allied Commission to assist the Austrian Government to assume full control of the affairs of state in Austria. Suppression and obstruction of police is patently inconsistent with this objective, and it is clearly the responsibility of the Allied Commission to assist the Austrian Government to recreate the respect for law and order. The support of elements of the population acting against the authority of the Austrian Government and its police and forcing the surrender of a government building to a rioting mob are contrary to this principle and call for action by the Allied Commission.

The Allied Commission did not consider that any of the three conditions set out in article 2 C of the control agreement under which they were empowered to act directly rather than through the Austrian Government was relevant in this case. The Allied Commission, therefore, took no action. Paragraph 2 D of the control agreement which authorized in certain circumstances independent action by the High Commissioners in the absence of action by the Allied Commission is equally inapplicable in this case. The Soviet commander had no justification to maintain law and order at Wiener Neustadt since Austrian authorities had already done so.

Article 1 of the control agreement states unequivocally that the authority of the Austrian Government shall extend fully throughout Austria with two exceptions, execution of directions from the Allied Commission and questions defined in article 5. In these recent events, the Allied Commission had issued no directives and certainly no situation existed in which article 5 would apply. Any move to immobilize the police and to establish internal boundaries of their authority is in conflict with the duties of the signatories of the control agreement.

The Government of the United States protests most emphatically against the perversion by the Soviet representative in the Allied Council in Austria of the clear language and intent of the control agreement of June 28, 1946, in attempting to justify unilateral controls over the Austrian police which would restrict or eliminate the authority of the Austrian Government in a part of its territory. The United States, therefore, calls upon the Soviet Government to issue appropriate instructions to the Soviet authorities in Austria to desist from interfering in the police functions of the Austrian Government.

Appointment of Officers

Dr. E. Wilder Spaulding as cultural affairs officer of the American Legation at Vienna, Austria, effective September 21, 1950.

United States Contribution to Improvement of World Health

by Willard L. Thorp

*Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs*¹

This concern of your Government for the health and well-being of other peoples as well as our own is not a phenomenon that has suddenly arisen out of the current conflict with Communist imperialism. That struggle has helped to focus public attention on unsatisfactory living conditions on which communism feeds. It has intensified both our awareness of these conditions and our efforts to improve them. But it is not the primary cause of our active and vital interest in the economic and social progress of other peoples.

The American people and their Government went out to do battle with disease long before the Communist menace assumed such threatening proportions. We will be engaged in that battle long after the Communist threat has receded into the past. This is true because our interest and our stake in the well-being of other people is based on something even more fundamental than a determination to beat back the encroachments of an evil tyranny.

It is based on a deep conviction that the very survival of our democratic society depends upon the creation of a free, peaceful, orderly, and prosperous world society. That is the aim of our foreign policy.

It would be a happy situation, indeed, if we could assume the existence of peace in the world, and dedicate all our efforts toward social and economic progress. But that is not the present nature of the world in which we live. We have had too clear a demonstration of the grasping ambition of the Communist empire builders, operating through direct and indirect aggression. The peace of the world is under continuous threat, and the immediate requirement of our foreign policy must be to find ways and means to discourage aggression and to stop it if need be. We are not alone in this desire. The General Assembly of the

United Nations is considering and certainly will approve stronger and more effective methods for preserving the peace. Back of that must be sufficient national and collective strength to deter any potential aggressor from embarking on the path of conquest and destruction.

But this is only one side of our foreign policy. The second, and no less important requirement, is the constructive effort to strengthen the economic and social foundations of the free world and so eventually to remove the basic causes of unrest, conflict, and human suffering. We Americans are builders. We like positive goals. To us, the concept of peace is important not merely because it involves the absence of war, but also because it offers the opportunity for man to progress and realize a fuller and better life.

There is a strong humanitarian element in our effort to do our part in the making of a peaceful, happy world. But a stronger motivating force is self-interest.

International health cooperation began, as you know, in the nineteenth century with efforts to prevent the spread of epidemic diseases. These efforts took the form of sanitary conventions which obligated countries to report the outbreak of cholera, plague, typhus, yellow fever, and smallpox. Treaties of this kind are still in force.

During the years, the responsibility for executing them has fallen successively to three organizations: the International Office of Public Health, established in Paris in 1908; the League of Nations' Health Organization, established in Geneva in 1923; and, now, the World Health Organization.

With the creation of the League of Nations, international health cooperation took on a much broader and more constructive character. At the request of governments, the League Health Organization provided advice on special health problems and the development of national health services. In this work, the League was, in effect, extending into a broader field the work which the

¹ Excerpts from address made before the American Public Health Association in St. Louis, Mo., on Oct. 31 and released to the press on the same date.

Pan American Sanitary Bureau had been carrying on in the Western Hemisphere since 1902.

Today, as I have said, disease must be prevented and eradicated at its source. To do this, nations must have strong national health administrations as well as strong links among them—the kind of links American health technicians have been forging for a generation.

Well before World War II, United States Public Health Service officers started to carry their technical skills abroad. They began to work in Latin American countries, mainly by being loaned to the Pan American Sanitary Bureau. This kind of technical cooperation was greatly expanded during the war by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. One great merit of the Institute is the perfection of the "servicio" system. In this type of arrangement, a contract is made under which the Institute undertakes to furnish expert personnel and dollar funds for specific projects in a Latin American country while the host country undertakes to furnish personnel and funds in the form of local currency. The projects may deal with malaria or yaws eradication in a given area. They may be related to the installation of water supply and sewerage systems in a city. The project is usually taken over by the host government when American technicians have shown the way.

During and after the war, the United States Government was a leading contributor to public health work abroad through our own army and through the work of UNRRA. The Economic Cooperation Administration took over UNRRA's responsibility for aid to Greece and the health part of this program was put into the hands of the Public Health Service.

One achievement has been the reduction of malaria, until recently a major hindrance to the economic progress of the Greek people. Meanwhile, the Public Health Service was given direct responsibility for important programs in Liberia and the Philippine Republic.

An active regional organization keeps the WHO in touch with the specific problems which affect the various parts of the world. The Pan American Sanitary Bureau is the regional office for the Western Hemisphere. There is a bureau for the Eastern Mediterranean area at Alexandria, Egypt, and one for Southeast Asia at Delhi, India. A Western Pacific region is being organized, while European and African affairs are provisionally handled at the Geneva headquarters.

WHO teams are already doing valuable work in many parts of the world. There are malaria, tuberculosis, and VD teams in India. There are yaws eradication teams in Indonesia. WHO sanitary engineers are working among the Arab refugees from Palestine. Expert advisers are stationed in many countries. An important fellowship program is slowly building a pool of trained

people who are destined to staff national health administrations. In short, the World Health Organization today stands ready to promote a large-scale campaign for health improvements in those parts of the world which need it most.

WHO Success Depends on Integration

The success of the WHO's program will depend in part on how closely and how well it can be integrated with the technical cooperation program of the United Nations as a whole. This program, you will remember, was conceived last June at the first Technical Assistance Conference of the United Nations. It was a historic conference, for it sparked the first organized, world-wide enterprise in technical aid to underdeveloped areas. Fifty nations came forward with financial contributions which added up to more than 20 million dollars for the first year. The United States Government is a major contributor, with 12 million dollars toward the first year's budget.

As the United Nations program took shape, so too did the other American activities in this field. In May, the Congress approved an act for international development, giving effect to the Point 4 policy enunciated by President Truman in his inaugural address of January 1949.

In August, Congress approved the first annual Point 4 appropriation of 34½ million dollars. And on September 8, President Truman issued an Executive order, delegating to the Secretary of State the responsibility for administering the Point 4 Program.

In addition, the Congress authorized the ECA to continue its technical assistance activities and to extend them to the area of Southeast Asia. This will be a sizable program, and health improvement will play an important part of it.

The stage has been set for both bilateral and multilateral action to safeguard life and health beyond our frontiers, and I have made no effort to summarize the many activities under private auspices which have and will do so much in this field.

There cannot be a single pattern for the various technical assistance projects in all countries. Some, like Turkey, Ceylon, western Pakistan, and Thailand, have gone a long way toward building up their public health organizations. In certain other countries almost everything remains to be done. In Indonesia, there is only one physician per 70,000 inhabitants and most of the professional personnel of the old health service have left. In many areas, such as India, and northern Thailand, malaria is the main obstacle to economic development. In parts of Java, it is yaws, which causes the most debility. Careful local planning is necessary, therefore, in every case.

Technical cooperation activities must be a harmonious whole. All the elements concerned must work together, both by fields of activity such as health, education, agriculture, industry and by

organizations, private, national, and international. Funds, equipment, and supplies are indispensable. But the greatest need will be for people who are not only good technicians but good teachers; people who are not only good Americans, but good internationalists. The Public Health Service will backstop these programs as far as it can, but it has not enough personnel to do it alone.

Need of Competent Personnel

That is why I come to you with an appeal. You have been leading this great popular movement which has made our cities and counties rate among the healthiest in the world. We hope and expect that when the time comes, and it will be soon, public health workers from our states, cities, and counties, and from our private health institutions too, will volunteer to go out and take their places in this unique enterprise in building a healthier world. It may be for a special quick tour of duty, or it may be to help on a continuing project. The degree of accomplishment is likely to be limited chiefly by the scarcity of competent personnel.

In appealing for your participation, I can give you, as yet, only a very general idea of the numbers of skilled people who will be needed. The United Nations will call upon people from many countries, but we know that they will need many from the United States. Under United States Government auspices, there are today well over 150 American health technicians of all kinds out in the field on technical assistance projects. By next June, we hope to have sent out an additional 300 new people, not counting replacements. While the number may be small, the rate of increase is what counts, and we expect that it will be proportionately larger in the following year. These figures do not, of course, include the many who have gone abroad under private auspices, and whose ranks, we hope, will be correspondingly augmented.

That is one side of the picture, but there is still another. Your cooperation will be needed also in providing hospitality, orientation and training to the many visitors, trainees, and graduate students who come to our shores to observe and study American techniques and health organization. In the past 4 months alone, more than 500 such people have come to the United States and many more are expected. I am speaking again of those for whom our Government has some measure of responsibility. I could not even guess at the number who have come under private auspices. So I think that there will be opportunities for all of you who are here today to play some part, either at home or abroad, in the international field of health improvement.

Let me add another word. There are intangible elements in this enterprise which you alone can furnish. Health is not the product of competent administration alone. It is not brought about by demonstrating the newest techniques with peni-

cillin, nor even by teaching in public health schools, important as that is. It is brought about by knowledge, skill, devotion and, above all, by teamwork. The health officer, the research worker, the practicing physician, the nurse, the engineer, the sanitarian, the dentist, the veterinarian, the statistician, and all the specialists of whatever description, are one great team which watches over the health of the American people. That spirit of cooperation has been fostered in the American Public Health Association for 78 years. In many of those countries to which our help must go that teamwork has never existed. Professional isolationism has been the rule. Perhaps the example of "teamwork"—and the visible proof of its value—may prove our greatest contribution to the welfare of our friends in distant lands.

So let us go forward in this great technical cooperation movement, planning, working, and carrying within us the American ideal of respect for each man, woman, or child, with good will toward all. We shall then be waging peace as never before in history, and on the battlefields of our endeavor we shall count by the millions not the dead, but the lives which have been saved.

Foreign Nationals Visit U.S.

Recent arrivals in the United States under the Department of State's grants-in-aid program include:

Henrik Hahr, program director of the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation of Stockholm, will tour major radio and television broadcasting centers throughout the United States. His itinerary will take him to New York, Chicago, Minneapolis, San Francisco, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Knoxville. Mr. Hahr expects to gather material about the United States for a series of programs over the Swedish network.

Dr. Aili Linnea Nurminen, chief meteorologist for aviation, Helsinki, Finland, is on a 6-month visit to confer with aeronautical meteorologists concerning her special studies in fog and cloud conditions. Her tour will include visits to civil aviation installations throughout the country.

Dr. José Faria Goes, professor of educational biology of the University of Brazil, Rio de Janeiro, is studying administrative techniques employed by American colleges and universities on a 3-month visit.

Dr. Julio de Armas, rector of the Central University of Venezuela, Caracas, is on a 10-week tour of leading educational centers in the United States. Dr. de Armas will study general administration of universities and colleges. He is also interested in student organizations and in college physical education programs.

Uniting for Peace

*Emergency Session of General Assembly—Peace Observation Commission—
National Armed Forces Elements—Collective Measures Committee—Human Rights
Be Respected—New Rules of Procedure*

U.N. doc. A/1481
Adopted Nov. 3, 1950

RESOLUTION A

The General Assembly,

RECOGNIZING that the first two stated Purposes of the United Nations are:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;"

REAFFIRMING that it remains to the primary duty of all Members of the United Nations, when involved in an international dispute, to seek settlement of such a dispute by peaceful means through the procedures laid down in Chapter VI of the Charter, and recalling the successful achievements of the United Nations in this regard on a number of previous occasions,

FINDING that international tension exists on a dangerous scale.

RECALLING its resolution 290 (IV) entitled "Essentials of peace," which states that disregard of the Principles of the Charter of the United Nations is primarily responsible for the continuance of international tension, and desiring to contribute further to the objectives of that resolution,

REAFFIRMING the importance of the exercise by the Security Council of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and the duty of the permanent members to seek unanimity and to exercise restraint in the use of the veto,

REAFFIRMING that the initiative in negotiating the agreements for armed forces provided for in Article 43 of the

Charter belongs to the Security Council, and desiring to ensure that, pending the conclusion of such agreements, the United Nations has at its disposal means for maintaining international peace and security,

CONSCIOUS that failure of the Security Council to discharge its responsibilities on behalf of all the Member States, particularly those responsibilities referred to in the two preceding paragraphs, does not relieve Member States of their obligations or the United Nations of its responsibility under the Charter to maintain international peace and security,

RECOGNIZING in particular that such failure does not deprive the General Assembly of its rights or relieve it of its responsibilities under the Charter in regard to the maintenance of international peace and security,

RECOGNIZING that discharge by the General Assembly of its responsibilities in these respects calls for possibilities of observation which would ascertain the facts and expose aggressors; for the existence of armed forces which could be used collectively; and for the possibility of timely recommendation by the General Assembly to Members of the United Nations for collective action which, to be effective, should be prompt,

A.

1. *Resolves* that if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security. If not in session at the time, the General Assembly may meet in emergency special session within twenty-four hours of the request therefor. Such emergency special session shall be called if requested by the Security Council on the vote of any seven members, or by a majority of the Members of the United Nations,

2. *Adopts* for this purpose the amendments to its rules of procedure set forth in the annex to the present resolution;

B.

3. *Establishes* a Peace Observation Commission for which the calendar years 1951 and 1952, shall be composed of fourteen Members, namely: China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Iraq, Israel, New Zealand, Pakistan, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay, and which could observe and report on the situation in any area where there exists international tension the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. Upon the invitation or with the consent of the State into whose territory the Commission would go, the General Assembly, or the Interim Committee when the Assembly is not in session, may utilize the Commission if the Security Council is not exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter with respect to the matter in question. Decisions to utilize the Commission shall be made on the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members present and voting. The Security Council may also utilize the Commission in accordance with its authority under the Charter;

4. *The Commission shall have* authority in its discretion to appoint subcommissions and to utilize the services of observers to assist it in the performance of its functions;

5. *Recommends* to all governments and authorities that they co-operate with the Commission and assist it in the performance of its functions;

6. *Requests* the Secretary-General to provide the necessary staff and facilities, utilizing, where directed by the Commission, the United Nations Panel of Field Observers envisaged in General Assembly resolution 297 B (IV);

C.

7. *Invites* each Member of the United Nations to survey its resources in order to determine the nature and scope of the assistance it may be in a position to render in support of any recommendations of the Security Council or of the General Assembly for the restoration of international peace and security;

8. *Recommends* to the States Members of the United Nations that each Member maintain within its national armed forces elements so trained, organized and equipped that they could promptly be made available, in accordance with its constitutional processes, for service as a United Nations unit or units, upon recommendation by the Security Council or General Assembly, without prejudice to the use of such elements in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognized in Article 51 of the Charter;

9. *Invites* the Members of the United Nations to inform the Collective Measures Committee provided for in paragraph 11 as soon as possible of the measures taken in implementation of the preceding paragraph;

10. *Requests* the Secretary-General to appoint, with the approval of the Committee provided for in paragraph 11, a panel of military experts who could be made available, on request, to Member States wishing to obtain technical

advice regarding the organization, training, and equipment for prompt service as United Nations units of the elements referred to in paragraph 8;

D.

11. *Establishes* a Collective Measures Committee consisting of fourteen Members, namely: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Egypt, France, Mexico, Philippines, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, and directs the Committee, in consultation with the Secretary-General and with such Member States as the Committee finds appropriate, to study and make a report to the Security Council and the General Assembly, not later than 1 September 1951, on methods, including those in Section C of the present resolution, which might be used to maintain and strengthen international peace and security in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter, taking account of collective self-defence and regional arrangements (Articles 51 and 52 of the Charter);

12. *Recommends* to all Member States that they co-operate with the Committee and assist it in the performance of its functions;

13. *Requests* the Secretary-General to furnish the staff and facilities necessary for the effective accomplishment of the purposes set forth in sections C and D of the present resolution;

E.

14. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, in adopting the proposals set forth above, is fully conscious that enduring peace will not be secured solely by collective security arrangements against breaches of international peace and acts of aggression, but that a genuine and lasting peace depends also upon the observance of all the Principles and Purposes established in the Charter of the United Nations, upon the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other principal organs of the United Nations intended to achieve the maintenance of international peace and security, and especially upon respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all and on the establishment and maintenance of conditions of economic and social well-being in all countries; and accordingly

15. *Urges* Member States to respect fully, and to intensify, joint action, in co-operation with the United Nations, to develop and stimulate universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to intensify individual and collective efforts to achieve conditions of economic stability and social progress, particularly through the development of under-developed countries and areas.

ANNEX

The rules of procedure of the General Assembly are amended in the following respects:

1. The present text of rule 8 shall become paragraph (a) of that rule, and a new paragraph (b) shall be added to read as follows:

"Emergency special sessions pursuant to resolution — (V) shall be convened within twenty-four hours of the

receipt by the Secretary-General of a request for such a session from the Security Council, on the vote of any seven members thereof, or of a request from a majority of the Members of the United Nations expressed by vote in the Interim Committee or otherwise, or of the concurrence of a majority of Members as provided in rule 9."

2. The present text of rule 9 shall become paragraph (a) of that rule and a new paragraph (b) shall be added to read as follows:

"This rule shall apply also to a request by any Member for an emergency special session pursuant to resolution — (V). In such a case the Secretary-General shall communicate with other Members by the most expeditious means of communication available."

3. Rule 10 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"In the case of an emergency special session convened pursuant to rule 8 (b), the Secretary-General shall notify the Members of the United Nations at least twelve hours in advance of the opening of the session."

4. Rule 16 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The provisional agenda of an emergency special session shall be communicated to the Members of the United Nations simultaneously with the communication summoning the session."

5. Rule 19 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"During an emergency special session additional items concerning the matters dealt with in resolution — (V) may be added to the agenda by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting."

6. There is added a new rule to precede rule 65 to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other rule and unless the General Assembly decides otherwise, the Assembly in case of an emergency special session, shall convene in plenary session only and proceed directly to consider the item proposed for consideration in the request for the holding of the session, without previous reference to the General Committee or to any other Committee; the President and Vice-Presidents for such emergency special sessions shall be, respectively, the Chairman of those delegations from which were elected the President and Vice-Presidents of the previous session."

RESOLUTION B

For the purpose of maintaining international peace and security, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and, in particular, with Chapters V, VI and VII of the Charter,

The General Assembly

Recommends to the Security Council:

That it should take the necessary steps to ensure that the action provided for under the Charter is taken with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace or acts of aggression and with respect to the peaceful settlement of disputes or situations likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security;

That it should devise measures for the earliest application of Articles 43, 45, 46 and 47 of the Charter of the

United Nations regarding the placing of armed forces at the disposal of the Security Council by the States Members of the United Nations and the effective functioning of the Military Staff Committee.

The above dispositions should in no manner prevent the General Assembly from fulfilling its functions under resolution — (V).

RESOLUTION C

The General Assembly,

RECOGNIZING that the primary function of the United Nations Organization is to maintain and promote peace, security and justice among all nations.

RECOGNIZING the responsibility of all Member States to promote the cause of international peace in accordance with their obligations as provided in the Charter,

RECOGNIZING that the Charter charges the Security Council with the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security,

REAFFIRMING the importance of unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council on all problems which are likely to threaten world peace,

RECALLING General Assembly resolution 190 (III) entitled "Appeal to the Great Powers to renew their efforts to compose their differences and establish a lasting peace,"

Recommends to the permanent members of the Security Council that:

(a) They meet and discuss, collectively or otherwise, and, if necessary, with other States concerned, all problems which are likely to threaten international peace and hamper the activities of the United Nations, with a view to their resolving fundamental differences and reaching agreement in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Charter;

(b) They advise the General Assembly and, when it is not in session, the Members of the United Nations, as soon as appropriate, of the results of their consultations.

New Rule on Majority Vote for General Assembly Decisions

U.N. doc. A/1476

Adopted Nov. 1, 1950

The General Assembly,

CONSIDERING its resolution 362 (IV) of 22 October 1949 on the methods and procedures of the General Assembly,

HAVING EXAMINED the report drawn up by the Secretary-General in pursuance of paragraph 7 of the above-mentioned resolution,

1. *Resolves* to insert in its rules of procedure a new rule 84 (a) worded as follows:

"New rule 84 (a)

"Decisions of the General Assembly on amendments to proposals relating to important questions, and on parts of such proposals put to the vote separately, shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting.";

2. *Resolves* that this new rule of procedure shall enter into force as from the adoption of the present resolution by the General Assembly.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

U.S. Attitude Concerning Yugoslav "Cease-Fire" Proposal

*Statement by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly¹*

The item we are now discussing—the duties of states in the event of the outbreak of hostilities—is one of two proposals submitted by Yugoslavia for strengthening the machinery of the United Nations, under the Charter, to maintain and preserve international peace and security. The Yugoslav delegation, in supporting the Uniting-for-Peace resolution has clearly demonstrated its real concern for the preservation of peace and any proposals which it makes are entitled to the most careful and sympathetic consideration by all the members of this Assembly.

My delegation shares many of the views so ably expressed by previous speakers. I will, therefore, not ask the Committee to listen to a long and repetitious statement, but it might be useful to sum up briefly the criticisms and suggestions already made and to add a few of our own.

As the Yugoslav delegation has explained, this proposal is designed to provide a simple and automatic cease-fire order to apply whenever and wherever hostilities break out. If a nation engaged in hostilities does not proclaim its readiness to cease fire or fails to cease fire and withdraw its forces, the Yugoslav proposal, if adopted by the General Assembly, would have the recalcitrant state automatically branded as an aggressor.

We take it that this resolution is designed to deter any would-be aggressor. If any state engaged in hostilities must cease fire within 24 hours and proceed to withdraw its troops, it will, of course, be unprofitable for it to begin hostilities. The resolution is also designed to terminate hostil-

ities once begun, regardless of the circumstances which led to the hostilities.

U.S. Sympathetic to Objectives

The United States Government is, of course, entirely sympathetic to these objectives. Anything which contributes toward these objectives is worth doing and is worth the time of this Assembly.

Certain aspects of this proposal, however, give us pause. There is one general difficulty—alluded to by our distinguished colleague from France—which applies to the resolution as a whole. The scheme it sets up applies equally to all states engaged in hostilities. It applies equally to innocent and guilty, to aggressor and victim. To put an unconditional obligation to cease fire upon the victim of aggression seems to us unsound. Indeed, the action of the United Nations in Korea represents the view that states should resist aggression and that the United Nations is designed to help them do so. A victim, therefore, should not be expected to cease fire except on certain conditions which could hardly be prescribed in advance without regard to the particular situation, or unless the Security Council or the General Assembly, having considered all the facts, set forth the terms for such a cease-fire.

Apart from this general difficulty, specific aspects of the resolution trouble us. Let us take first the provision for an automatic cease-fire which troubled also my distinguished colleagues from the United Kingdom and France. We cannot really believe that a state bent on aggression, prepared to disregard the Charter of the United

¹ Made in Committee I (Political and Security) of the United Nations on November 7 and released to the press by the U.S. delegation to the General Assembly on the same date.

Nations and the many resolutions of the General Assembly implementing the Charter obligation to refrain from aggression, would be deterred by a general resolution recommending cease-fire for all participants in hostilities. Nor can we believe that a state which has begun aggression would then pay the slightest heed to a general resolution recommending that it cease fire.

That such a resolution would hardly deter or terminate aggression is only part of our difficulty. After careful study, my delegation has reached the conclusion already expressed to other delegations that this provision for an automatic cease-fire might even aid potential aggressors in their illegal designs and interfere with the operations of the United Nations in its effort to maintain the peace. An aggressor, who has begun hostilities and is fully intent on continuing them, might well declare that he will cease fire as a tactical device to lull the victim into security and gain time to make the aggression really effective. Later, such a state could always find some pretext for justifying its subsequent failure to observe its cease-fire declaration. Moreover, no machinery is provided for observing or supervising the cease-fire. Under cover of a pretended cease-fire, the aggressor state could continue the aggression. The fact that, even after a purported cease-fire, a state has 48 hours to withdraw its troops could also be utilized to gain tactical advantage, to move forces about to improve its strategic position, and there would be no one to observe whether forces are, in fact, being moved and where they are being moved.

Action Would Hamper U.N.

As has been already noted, the automatic cease-fire aspect of the plan proposed by Yugoslavia might in practice also hamper the full freedom of the Security Council or of the General Assembly to take effective collective action against aggression. The Security Council would always be tempted to wait until the end of 24 hours after aggression has begun to see whether the parties will declare their readiness to cease fire. If such a declaration is issued, the Security Council or the Assembly might be reluctant to interfere and might delay appropriate action in the circumstances. Yet such a delay could be fatal.

There is one other serious question: This concerns the provision that any state failing to declare that it will cease fire, or failing, in fact, to break off hostilities and withdraw its troops, will be branded automatically as an aggressor. There is a legal difficulty here in that through this resolution, the General Assembly would undertake in advance to brand a state as an aggressor without regard to the action which the Security Council might take in the case when the conflict breaks out. Article 39 specifically provides that the Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression, and take steps accordingly.

Our distinguished colleague from Colombia has set forth some of the past efforts to define aggression. In our view—and we shall have more to say on this subject in another context—those efforts have proved that any general definition of aggression, without regard to the facts of a specific case, is a hopeless and unrewarding task. Again, we are not quite clear as to what is the effect of having a state branded as an aggressor. Presumably, fear of being so branded is intended to have a deterrent effect. But it will undoubtedly be expected to have other practical effects. Is such a determination to be binding on the Security Council or the General Assembly? If so, the Assembly would in effect be cutting away the free discretion and judgment of the Security Council. If the case should later come before the Assembly, the Assembly would have also been committed in advance without determining on the basis of the facts before it whether there has been something which should be called aggression.

And, if neither of the parties makes the declaration or ceases fire are both to be branded as aggressors? Presumably that is the intention, yet it could serve no purpose except to confuse and hamper United Nations action. We might also have an anomalous situation where a state clearly the victim of aggression would be branded as an aggressor pursuant to this resolution. If, for example, state A should drop bombs on state B and the latter, in retaliation, should take land action against the aggressor, state A might well indicate that it is prepared to cease fire, or pretend that it is, while state B, which suffered aggression, might feel it impracticable in the circumstances to cease fire unconditionally. Yet it would be state B, the victim, which would be branded an aggressor under the present resolution.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, this provision in the present resolution overlooks the complex of factors which might go into a determination of aggression. Such a determination of aggression requires findings of fact, and considered judgment on the basis of these facts by the Security Council, or by the General Assembly.

Yugoslav Plan Considered Laudable

Having indicated the difficulties we have with the Yugoslav proposal, we still believe that the objectives of the Yugoslav plan are entirely laudable and that the basic idea can be utilized. We believe, for example, that there is considerable merit in the Yugoslav suggestion, with the modification proposed by our United Kingdom colleague—i. e., that if states become engaged in hostilities, they should take reasonable steps to bring the hostilities to a close and settle the dispute by peaceful methods. Of course, the victim should not be expected to "cease fire" unless the aggressor agrees to comply with certain legitimate conditions. At the same time, as our Cuban colleague has noted, both

parties would be expected to heed orders of the Security Council or recommendations of the Council or the General Assembly. A provision in such terms would be entirely proper and consistent with article 2 of the Charter which requires all members to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Another meritorious idea in the Yugoslav resolution is the suggestion that all states engaged in hostilities proclaim their good will to the judgment of the world. For example, we could have the Assembly recommend to all parties engaged in hostilities that they immediately inform the United Nations. Such a notification would bring the conflict immediately to the attention of the world and of the organs which have a duty to deal with them. The Security Council could take action or if it fails to exercise its responsibility in the case it may, by vote of any seven members, request the Secretary-General to convene an emergency special session of the General Assembly within 24 hours to consider the matter, in accordance with the uniting-for-peace resolution. The members of the United Nations also will be watching the Security Council to see whether it exercises its primary responsibility, and if it fails to do so, a majority of them might wish to request an emergency special session of the General Assembly.

It seems entirely feasible and desirable also to require states to inform the world why they are engaged in hostilities. Such a requirement would recognize that the use of force as an instrument of national policy is inconsistent with the principles of the Charter, and that there is a presumption that the use of force violates the Charter. However, the Charter does recognize the right to self-defense or collective self-defense under article 51. It does recognize that members may and should take collective action on the request of the Security Council or the recommendation of the General Assembly. All states engaged in hostilities will, therefore, be required to show cause, as the lawyers say; that is, to indicate why the state believes it is justified in using force. A victim of aggression would, of course, be entirely justified under article 51 and would indicate that fact in its declaration. The aggressor would have no justification under the Charter and any attempt in a public statement to the United Nations to invoke some provision of the Charter to mask an aggressive action would easily be unmasked. The requirement to issue such a declaration, we believe, would make a state think twice before starting hostilities. Such notification by the parties to armed conflict would help the Security Council, in the first instance, and the members to determine what steps should be taken to restore peace.

Another interesting idea which my delegation believes should be utilized is that contained in the Cuban amendment to the Yugoslav resolution. In its present form, this amendment does not eliminate some of the difficulties with the automatic cease-fire proposal which we have indicated. In addition, it appears to constitute an important modification of the provisions of the uniting-for-peace resolution which established the Peace Observation Commission. It also raises serious questions under the Charter, since the Peace Observation Commission would be dispatched without regard to whether the Security Council was acting in the case.

We do believe, however, that there is great merit in the idea of bringing the Peace Observation Commission into the scheme developed from the Yugoslav resolution. It would seem entirely feasible and desirable, for example, to have states engaged in hostilities declare also whether they are prepared to receive and to cooperate with the Peace Observation Commission and its subcommittees or observers, if the Commission should be dispatched by the appropriate organ of the United Nations, assuming, of course, that the Peace Observation Commission is not already functioning there. In this way, a state will give further evidence of its innocence and of the fact that it has nothing to hide. In addition, if the General Assembly or the Interim Committee is considering whether to dispatch the Peace Observation Commission to the area of tension, those organs will know in advance whether the state, in whose territory the Commission would go, is prepared to admit and cooperate with the Commission.

Following through on another idea contained in the Yugoslav proposal, we believe that failure to make a declaration or notification of the kind indicated, or, on the contrary, willingness to cooperate by making such declaration would be taken into account by the Security Council or the General Assembly when they are considering the case in question. The effect which the United Nations would give to the conduct of the parties in regard to the required declaration cannot be fixed exactly in advance, but it may be presumed that, in general, compliance would indicate respect for world opinion and readiness to cooperate with the United Nations. Failure to issue such a declaration would have contrary implications.

These suggestions, Mr. Chairman, in our opinion would improve the ideas contained in the Yugoslav proposal and make them more effective in fulfilling the objectives of deterring aggression and putting an end to it once it occurs. Such a resolution would be a fitting supplement to actions already taken by this Assembly to strengthen the United Nations for its role of maintaining international peace and security in the resolutions on uniting for peace and in the proposal on peace through deeds adopted by this Committee.

Soviet Definition of Aggression

We should like to say a word about the Soviet resolution introduced and explained yesterday. This resolution is of a character basically different from that of the Yugoslav resolution and is admittedly an attempt at a comprehensive definition of aggression.

It is not entirely clear to my delegation in what way such a definition of aggression comes appropriately under an item entitled "Duties of states in the event of outbreak of hostilities." It is even less clear to my delegation why the Soviet delegation deems it fit to introduce a proposal of this kind at this stage of this session of the General Assembly.

Proposals for a definition of aggression are not new. Such proposals have been suggested and debated at international conferences and in international bodies for many years. Indeed the Soviet proposal which is before us now is the identical proposal introduced in the League of Nations in 1933 by Mr. Litvinoff, and allowing for slight differences in translation into English, it may be found word for word in the records of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, series B, Minutes of the General Commission, volume II, pages 237, 238.

At the Disarmament conference in 1933, there was already sharp division as to whether a comprehensive definition of aggression is desirable or feasible. The issue was again raised at San Francisco in 1945 and after extended debate the Committee which considered the matter concluded that a definition of aggression could not be achieved at that conference and was beyond the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. It was decided to leave to appropriate organs of the United Nations—in the first instance, the Security Council—the decision as to whether a given set of facts constitutes an act of aggression.

The Government of the United States has in the past expressed strong opposition to any attempt to define aggression. My Government is still of that opinion. No definition of aggression could possibly be complete, and omission is a trap for a victim and an invitation to an aggressor. I note that the Soviet definition, for example, contains no reference to indirect aggression or to subversion, or to fomenting civil strife, which this Committee, only the other day, cited as an example of aggression by an overwhelming vote.

In the view of my delegation, an attempt at a comprehensive definition of aggression would be inconsistent with the system of the Charter which contemplated that whether there has been aggression should be determined by the appropriate organ of the United Nations, on the facts of a given case. The Soviet Union, which has been so vociferous in its concern for preserving the powers of the Security Council, seems quite prepared to disregard article 39 of the Charter which

provides that the Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression. A definition of aggression adopted by the General Assembly could not control the Security Council, and would not be binding on the General Assembly when it considered whether there was aggression in a particular case.

Presumably, even if the definition proposed by the Soviet Union had been on the books, the Soviet Union would still seek to tell this Assembly that there was no aggression against the Republic of Korea on June 25, or would even allege that it was the forces of the United Nations which committed aggression in Korea. It is not a definition of aggression which is needed but a desire and a determination on the part of all nations to live up to the principles of the Charter and to cooperate with the United Nations in maintaining these principles.

U.N. Commission Conducts Survey in North Korean Area

[Released to the press by the U.N. Department of Public Information November 4]

United Nations representatives, flying in their United Nations' aircraft UN-99, crossed the 38th parallel on November 3 and landed in Pyongyang to learn of conditions in the northern Korean capital and to inform the city of recent United Nations actions.

Delegates who formerly served with the United Nations Commission on Korea (UNCOK) visited the city as an advance guard to their successors in the new United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK). In addition, one member of the new Commission was present.

Ambulance planes unloaded casualties while the United Nations representatives were present, and the aircraft UN-99 ferried 32 wounded men to Seoul on the return trip.

While the delegates were in Pyongyang, they met Col. Charles Munske of Brooklyn, civil assistance officer for the province, and members of the newly appointed emergency city council. They learned of difficult conditions in the damaged city and gave news of General Assembly actions and plans.

The visitors included O. N. H. M. Smyth, newly arrived Australian representative on UNCURK, Ting-teh Ssutu (China), Henri Brionval (France), F. Sanchez Hernande (El Salvador), Dr. Anup Singh and C. Kondapi (India), and two members of the Commission secretariat.

Discussion of the Reelection of Trygve Lie as Secretary-General

*Statement by Warren R. Austin
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly¹*

Mr. President, The Assembly has before it a resolution sponsored by Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Greece, India, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Yugoslavia. It proposes that Mr. Trygve Lie be continued in office for an additional period of 3 years.

Acting in the capacity of President of the Security Council, and with the approval of the Council, I wrote to the President of the General Assembly on October 12, and again on October 25, informing him that the Security Council had been unable to reach agreement on a new recommendation. Yesterday, October 30, I addressed a third letter to the President of the Assembly informing him further that a resolution presented to the Security Council by the representative of the Soviet Union, proposing that the Security Council should request the General Assembly to postpone consideration of the appointment of a Secretary-General, had failed of adoption by a vote of one in favor, seven against and three abstentions.

Under these circumstances, the wise and proper course appears to be to continue Mr. Lie in office.

A 3-year extension is proposed because a shorter period would impair administrative order and jeopardize the stability of the Secretariat. At the same time, Mr. Lie has expressed to the sponsors of the resolution who approached him on the matter, the wish that he not be asked to serve for more than 3 years. This resolution respects that desire and insures orderly continuity in the administration of a great and growing institution.

It would have been preferable if this issue could have been presented to the General Assembly as a consequence of agreement in the Security Council. As President of the Council and as the representative of the United States, I regret that agreement has not been reached.

During September and early October, three distinct efforts were made to bring about consultations on this subject among the five permanent members of the Security Council. The first of these efforts was made by the September President of the Security Council, the representative of the United Kingdom. Unfortunately, all three attempts failed because one of the permanent members did not respond to the requests for consultation.

These failures did not suppress the desire of the United States for consultation and agreement.

¹ Made before the plenary session of the General Assembly on the item of "Appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations" on Oct. 31 and released to the press by the U.S. delegation to the General Assembly on the same date.

When the Security Council met to consider the question of the appointment of a Secretary-General, our minds were open to the consideration of all proposals on their merits. Yugoslavia proposed the reappointment of Mr. Lie. A few days later, the Soviet Union nominated the Foreign Minister of Poland. With these candidates before it, the Security Council voted nine to one, with one abstention, in favor of Mr. Lie. The one vote in opposition was a veto of the will of the majority of nine.

We cannot conceal from ourselves or from world public opinion that in this situation the veto was employed to punish the Secretary-General for carrying out faithfully the decisions of the Security Council to resist aggression in Korea.

The veto was not employed because Mr. Lie had been incompetent, timid, or derelict in his duty. It was employed because his actions, in response to the expressed wish of 53 member states, did not conform to the national policies of one of the permanent members.

New tactics then were introduced to support the use of the veto. At last the Soviet Union sought consultations. The permanent members met privately twice. Four more meetings of the Security Council were held. The names of able and highly esteemed individuals were placed before the Council. But the issue was now focused on principles and not on personalities. The use of the veto to punish the Secretary-General for his efforts to resist aggression in Korea had made it impossible to consider individual nominees on their merits. Therefore, the inability of the Council to agree on a new recommendation casts no discredit whatever on those whose names arose in this situation. All of them are splendid men. We have only the highest respect and admiration for their ability and their integrity. We prize the friendship of all of them. Their names, like that of Mr. Lie, were involved in an issue dealing with principles rather than persons.

The United States strongly opposed the effort to punish Mr. Lie. It did so not on the ground that the selection of a Secretary-General is a matter in respect to which the veto should be exercised. The United States took its stand on the ground that the improper exercise of the veto should not be allowed to coerce the majority into abandoning its own principles.

The resolution now before the Assembly is a continuation of the effort to maintain the integrity and independence of the office of the Secretary-General. It is a continuation of the effort to strengthen the capacity of the Secretary-General, whoever he may be, to function without fear of reprisal from one of the permanent members of the Security Council. It is a continuation of the effort to maintain the unity achieved by 53 members in resisting armed aggression.

This is a fateful period in mankind's struggle against war. For the first time in history, a world

organization has undertaken to meet aggression by force. Fifty-three member states declared their adherence to that cause. Men and women from many of the nations represented here have offered to give their lives to defend the United Nations. Thousands of them have been required to pay that price. To insure the victory of the United Nations and to heal the scars of aggression, further sacrifice and support will be required of us. The struggles we have undergone and the challenges we face, call upon us to guard and to keep our unity.

History, speaking in venerable accents, of the Fifth General Assembly, will characterize it for its great gains in advancing security against aggression of any kind. This is the Assembly of collective security. History will regard our individual acts as part of the total effort. It will look to the resolution on "Uniting for Peace," the resolution on "Peace Through Deeds," the resolutions for the unification and for the rehabilitation of Korea, and the unity of 53 members in carrying out a recommendation—not an order—to defend a creation of the United Nations—the Republic of Korea—from armed attack—history will view all these as part of the whole effort to lay foundations for the security of all peace-loving nations.

The issue that confronts us now is also part of the same struggle for peace. We cannot permit our efforts to be undermined, sabotaged, or attacked indirectly by a veto of the man who had the courage to take his stand against aggression in Korea on the 25th of June. History will not separate what we do here on this issue from the struggle against aggression now being successfully completed in Korea. Let us stand against all efforts to weaken the structure of collective security we have built together since June 25. Let us keep the unity that has brought the United Nations to a new peak in power and prestige, to a new pinnacle in the hearts of unnumbered millions who yearn for peace.

Whatever any of us may feel about his views on particular issues from time to time, we know from experience that Trygve Lie will perform his duty independently and courageously. We know he will defend the Charter. We know he will labor to promote peace, justice and well-being in the interest of all the members of the United Nations. We hope the Assembly will agree with the sponsors of this resolution that he should be continued in office for another 3 years.

Resolution Continuing the Secretary-General in Office

U.N. doc. A/1475
Adopted Nov. 1, 1950

The General Assembly,
HAVING RECEIVED communications from the President of the Security Council, dated 12 October and 25 October 1950, stating that the Security Council has been unable to agree on a recommendation to the General Assembly regarding the appointment of a Secretary-General,

CONSIDERING the necessity to ensure the uninterrupted exercise of the functions vested by the Charter in the Office of the Secretary-General,

CONSIDERING that the Security Council recommended to the first regular session of the General Assembly the appointment of Mr. Trygve Lie as Secretary-General and that, on 1 February 1946, the General Assembly appointed Mr. Trygve Lie as Secretary-General for a five-year term,

Decides that the present Secretary-General shall be continued in office for a period of three years.

Procedure To Admit Chinese Communists for U.N. Session

*Statement by Warren R. Austin
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly¹*

I think it is well known in the organs of the United Nations that the United States has been and is most strongly opposed to seating in the United Nations the Communist Chinese regime. Nor is it necessary for me to say any more than I have about the reasons for this position.

I have listened with care and with respect to the views expressed by the representatives of the Soviet Union and United Kingdom, who wished to invite the representatives of the Chinese Communist regime to be present in the Security Council during our consideration of this grave and serious issue.

The people of the world do not want a general war. Probably there is no emotion that stirs their hearts more deeply than this overwhelming desire to avoid extension of the fighting outside of Korea. But, the present facts which are before us could be interpreted as a provocation to general war. This makes a difference in the problem that confronts us, the delegation of the United States, the representative of the United States, than when we were considering a petition to admit the representative of the north Korean aggressors to the Council. To us, it seems quite different.

There might be gained some information from witnesses from the Chinese Communist regime which might guide us toward prevention of a general war, prevention of an extension of the existing struggle in Korea.

We voted against the admission of a witness from the aggressors—the north Koreans. The circumstances were quite different from these.

The whole purpose of the Security Council had been expressed in resolutions that have become public and which aimed at confining the conflict to the area and preventing a world war. The United Nations had there, on the spot, a commission that it had created for the very purpose of negotiating with the north Koreans as well as the south Koreans. Time after time, they had offered

¹ Made in the Security Council on Nov. 8 and released to the press by the U.S. delegation to the General Assembly on the same date.

the opportunity to the north Koreans. Time after time, they had tried to get access into north Korea for the purpose of talking with the north Koreans. This possibility of pacific negotiation was declined, was refused, and the aggression of the north Koreans continued on south Korea.

Now, I reject the concept of an invitation to this regime of the sort that the Security Council characteristically tenders in its efforts to adjust controversies by peaceful means. If the point of view of members who have spoken is to become the view of the Security Council, I believe that this regime should not be invited, but rather they should be summoned to appear before this organ in their true character, with its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace. It should afford the community of nations such explanation as it can for the state of affairs which we are forced to consider. In this case, I think I should have some direct and serious questions which I should like to put to such witnesses.

But let no representative at this table, and no person anywhere, feel that my Government would lend itself to any tactic of delay. I would most vigorously insist that the procedures of this body cannot and should not be delayed or hindered either by reasons of a summons to this regime to appear before it or by reason of their conduct here.

[Released to the press November 9]

On September 29, the Security Council of the United Nations passed a resolution inviting the Chinese Communist regime to be represented during the discussion by the Security Council of that government's declaration regarding an armed invasion of the Island of Taiwan (Formosa). When the Secretary-General of the United Nations was notified by the Communist regime of the appointment of its representative and eight-member staff, he requested the Government of the United States to make the necessary arrangements for the entry of these persons to the headquarters district.

Although the United States does not recognize the Chinese Communist regime and while it voted against the Security Council resolution inviting the Chinese Communists to the headquarters of the United Nations, it is incumbent on this Government to make it possible for the resolution to take effect. These persons are invitees of the United Nations. The headquarters agreement, entered into between this Government and the United Nations when that organization agreed to locate its headquarters here, specifically provides, in part, that—

The Federal, State, or local authorities of the United States shall not impose any impediments to transit to or from the headquarters district of . . . persons invited to the headquarters district by the United Nations . . .

Since these persons would otherwise be inadmissible under our immigration laws, they are being

granted transit to the headquarters district under the discretionary authority of the Attorney General of the United States contained in the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 15, 1917, as amended. The Department of State has advised the American Embassy in Praha, Czechoslovakia, to issue appropriate visas upon application by the Chinese Communists representative of his staff.²

The names of the Chinese Communists who are coming to Lake Success for discussion of the Formosa question at the invitation of the Security Council, according to information received from the Secretary General, follow below:

Representative: Wu Hsiu-chuan.

Adviser: Chiao Kuan-Jua.

Staff Members: Kung Poo-sung, An Tung, Chen Chiao, Pu Shan, Chou Yen, Sun Piap, and Wang Nai-ching.

Apology Before U.N. for U.S. Aircraft Violation of Frontier

U.N. doc. S/1856
Dated Oct. 19, 1950

The United States representative to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honor to advise that the Commander in Chief of the United Nations command has reported the following facts to be submitted to the Security Council for its information.

An attack was made by two United States jet aircraft on 8 October 1950, against Soviet aircraft on an airfield in the vicinity of Sukhya Rechka. The pilots had been specifically briefed not to violate the Manchurian or Soviet border. The attack was the result of navigation error and poor judgment, in that it was made without positive identification of the target. The commander of the Air Force group concerned has been relieved and appropriate steps have been taken with a view toward disciplinary action against the two pilots involved.

In connection with the above report of the Commander in Chief of the United Nations command, the United States Government desires to express publicly its regret that American Forces under the United Nations command should have been involved in this violation of the Soviet frontier. As evidence of its good faith, the United States Government is prepared to supply funds for payment of any damages, determined by a United Nations Commission or other appropriate procedure, to have been inflicted upon Soviet property.

² It is understood that the delegation would travel via Praha.

General Keyes Retires as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria

[Released to the press October 30]

Secretary Acheson forwarded the following letter to Lt. Gen. Geoffrey Keyes, upon his retirement as United States High Commissioner in Austria.

October 25, 1950

DEAR GENERAL KEYES: As United States High Commissioner in Austria since 1947, you have occupied a difficult post in a country whose independence and prosperity is of great importance in American policy. I offer you my hearty congratulations on your splendid record of achievement in that post. I am sure it will be a source of keen satisfaction to you to know that you left Austria in a stronger position than you found it and that you have advanced successfully the objectives of our policy.

It is especially noteworthy that representatives of the Four Powers have continued to meet together in Austria and that the unity of the country has been maintained. This has been accomplished without appeasement or surrender either on our part or on the part of the Austrian Government. Your firm, but fair stand in the Allied Council, your close cooperation with your British and French colleagues, and your confidence in the Austrian Government have contributed greatly to make possible this unique situation.

The Department of State will continue this policy in order that the quadripartite organization may be maintained intact until such time as the conclusion of the Treaty will restore full independence to the Austrian people.

I hope that in your retirement, after many years of devoted service to the American people, you will always regard the success of your mission in Austria as a major contribution to European reconstruction.

Germany Asked To Consider Revival of Prewar Treaties

[Released to the press November 8]

United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy has informed the Department of State that the Allied High Commission has invited the Federal Government—and other interested countries are being invited through diplomatic channels—to inform the High Commission of those treaties of the former German Reich which they would like to see revived and made effective as between the Federal Government and the country concerned.

The Commission pointed out that this action is an important step in implementation of the For-

eign Ministers' decisions in this sphere. At New York in September, the Ministers reaffirmed their desire to integrate the Federal Republic into the community of free nations and they recognized that the Federal Government is the only German Government freely and legitimately constituted and, therefore, entitled to speak for Germany as representative of the German people in foreign affairs.

The Federal Government has already given an interim reply to the High Commissioners' request. It has stated that work is going ahead on a memorandum concerning the prewar treaties and agreements the Federal Government would wish to have made applicable in the territory of the Federal Republic.

In principle, where the Federal Republic and the other power or powers concerned jointly desire that effect shall be given to a particular treaty, the High Commission will agree to this action. In acting upon these requests, the High Commission will, of course, have regard to such considerations as the avoidance of prejudice to the eventual peace settlement with Germany and the avoidance of conflict with the Occupation Statute or with the terms of any agreement relating to or affecting Germany to which the occupying powers are parties.

THE CONGRESS

Legislation

Burial and Education Benefits for Philippine Veterans. Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4540, 4689, and 4761—Bills to provide a more satisfactory program of benefits relating to active service in the armed forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines during World War II, and for other purposes. H. R. 8077 and 8104—Bills to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941. May 2, 1950. (Department of State, pp. 1695-1697.) 81st Cong., 2d sess. 35 pp.

Amendments to Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928. Hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6074—A bill to amend section 2 of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, as amended. May 8, 1950. (Department of State, p. 17.) 81st Cong., 2d sess. 20 pp.

Departments of State, Justice, Commerce and the Judiciary Appropriations for 1951. Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Part 1. (Same index appears in parts 1 and 2.) 81st Cong., 2d sess. 1131 pp.

The Deficiency Appropriation Bill, 1950. Hearings before the Subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. (Department of State, pp. 640-661.) 81st Cong., 2d sess. 817 pp.

The United States in the United Nations

[November 11-17, 1950]

General Assembly

General debate on the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee resolution on Libyan independence was concluded November 16 by the General Assembly. The afternoon session was adjourned, however, before final action was taken on the Committee's resolution.

President Nasrollah Entezam nominated seven countries for membership in the Special Committee to make recommendations on the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations, but a decision on composition of the committee was postponed temporarily.

Additional action taken on November 16 included the following: approval of five Committee V reports; adoption of an amended Committee VI report on reservations to multilateral conventions by a vote of 47 (U.S.)-5 (Soviet bloc)-5; and approval 38-6-13 of the establishment of an International Bureau for Declaration of Death of Missing Persons.

Committee I (Political and Security).—Consideration began this week on the agenda item "Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece." Debate centered around a resolution sponsored by the United States, United Kingdom, France, Australia, and Pakistan, which notes, despite improvement in the frontier situation, that threats to Greece remain; gives approval to the report of the United Nations Special Commission on the Balkans; continues the Commission in being until the sixth session of the General Assembly with the same terms of reference unless the Commission recommends to the Interim Committee its own dissolution; and authorizes the Interim Committee to act on such recommendations as it thinks proper. Speaking in support of the resolution, United States Delegate Benjamin V. Cohen declared, "We want to discontinue the Special Committee at the earliest possible moment but not at the expense of Greek independence. If the Cominform delegations want the Special Committee discontinued let them see that Greece's northern neighbors leave Greece in peace." Debate was completed on the 5-state proposal on November 14 when the Committee approved it by a vote of 52-6 (Soviets and Yugoslavia).

Further action taken by Committee I on the Greek question during the week included the adoption on November 14 (53-5-1) of a Greek resolution calling for repatriation of members of the Greek armed forces still detained by Greece's

northern neighbors, and a 4-State resolution adopted on November 15 by a vote of 53-0-5 which expresses concern over the failure of the countries responsible to repatriate the Greek children they hold and establishes a standing committee to assist in the repatriation of these children in cooperation with the Red Cross.

The Committee then turned to the Formosa item and United States Representative John Foster Dulles moved that consideration be deferred. He told the Committee that in the light of the conduct of the Chinese Communist regime in several areas "we face the risk that the whole area may be engulfed in aggressive war. If that is going to happen, then a discussion here of the long-range future of Formosa would be somewhat academic." Mr. Dulles added that the only reason he suggested postponement of the Formosa discussion was that "lest by misventure in the course of our debate here we might say something about this delicate problem which might make more difficult that already difficult enough task of the Security Council." The motion for postponement was approved 53-0-5.

Earlier in the week the Committee voted 46-5-5 to refer a proposal for the establishment of a permanent commission of good offices to the Interim Committee for further study.

Ad Hoc Political Committee.—Debate continued during the first two meetings of the week on the Eritrean question, but further discussion was postponed on November 13 in order that the various sponsors of resolutions and amendments relating to Eritrea might be given time to work out a compromise resolution.

Committee consideration of the question of Indians in South Africa was initiated on November 14 and continued during the remainder of the week.

Committee II (Economic and Financial).—Committee II gave unanimous approval for technical assistance to Libya following its achievement of independence. Debate began on an Ecosoc resolution of August 15, 1950, on full employment.

Joint Committee II and III.—The Joint Committee completed general debate on chapters I, VIII (Sec. 2) and X of the Ecosoc report on November 11 and debate began on the Ecosoc resolution on the relief and rehabilitation of Korea. Final action on the resolution was postponed on November 15 pending receipt of Committee V's report on financing methods.

Committee III (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural).—General debate on the resolution con-

cerning future work of the Human Rights Commission was completed by Committee III on November 16, but a final vote on the resolution as a whole was deferred. The Committee then adopted the amended text of a United States resolution which recommends that December 10, the anniversary of the General Assembly's adoption of the Human Rights Declaration, be designated as United Nations Human Rights Day.

Committee IV (Trusteeship).—Committee IV adopted on November 16, by a vote of 44-5-1 a resolution, cosponsored by the United States, recommending General Assembly approval of the trusteeship agreement for Somaliland under Italian administration.

Committee V (Administrative and Budgetary).—On November 14 the Committee unanimously approved a resolution which noted the Secretary-General's report on the United Nations headquarters, continued the Headquarters Advisory Committee with existing membership, and requested the Secretary-General to report to the next regular session on construction progress. The request of Committee II and III for advice on the financial implications of the plan for the relief and rehabilitation of Korea was referred to the Advisory Committee.

Committee VI (Legal).—Consideration by Committee VI of Part III (Formulation of Nuremberg Principles) of the International Law Commission Report was completed on November 14. The Committee approved 32-1-3 a 16-nation resolution, of which the United States was one of the sponsors, which invites governments to furnish observations on the formulation of the Nuremberg Principles and requests the Commission, in preparing the code of offenses against the peace and security of mankind, to take account of observations by governments and comments by delegates to the Fifth General Assembly.

The Security Council

The Security Council began consideration of the 6-nation resolution on Korea on November 10 following the approval by a vote of 9-0, Egypt abstaining and the U.S.S.R. not voting, of a French proposal that the Council consider the Korean question before the Palestine agenda item. Earlier the Council rejected by a vote of 1-10 a Soviet proposal that consideration of the Special Report of the United Nations Command in Korea be deleted from the agenda. The 6-state resolution, sponsored by Cuba, Ecuador, France, Norway, United Kingdom, and the United States, recalls earlier resolutions by the Security Council and General Assembly on Korea, notes the intervention of Chinese Communist troops in Korea, affirms that United Nations forces will not remain in Korea longer than necessary, calls upon all states and authorities not to aid or encourage the North Korean forces, and affirms that the policy of the

United Nations is to hold inviolate the Chinese frontier with Korea and to protect fully legitimate Chinese and Korean interests in the frontier zone. Council debate on the resolution was renewed on November 16. At that time the U.S.S.R. representative announced that he would vote against the resolution because it was based on the "erroneous" MacArthur report and previous "illegal" Security Council resolutions.

In reply to Soviet charges of United States aggression and to those allegations against the United States contained in a letter from the Chinese Communist Foreign Minister, United States Representative Ernest A. Gross read a statement made by President Truman earlier in the day in which he declared, in referring to the 6-state resolution, "that all members of the Security Council genuinely interested in restoring peace in the Far East will not only support this resolution but also use their influence to obtain compliance with it Speaking for the United States Government and people, I can give assurance that we support and are acting within the limits of United Nations policy in Korea, and that we have never at any time entertained any intention to carry hostilities into China."

On November 13 the Security Council also discussed the Palestine item, and three draft resolutions on this question were submitted.

Economic and Social Council

Members of the Council accepted on November 14 a Chilean invitation to hold the 12th session of the Economic and Social Council (Ecosoc) at Santiago, Chile. The Council also adopted unanimously a resolution relating to the status of nongovernmental organizations under the United Nations Headquarters agreement.

Specialized Agencies

At its recent special session conference in Washington, the Food and Agricultural Organization admitted five new members—Federal Republic of Germany, Cambodia, Viet Nam, Spain, Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan.

The Executive Board of United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) held its 24th meeting in Paris from November 2-10. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the organization's 1952 program and budget. The Board unanimously voted to confirm the initial appropriation of \$175,000 to provide teachers and educational material for Korea. Appointment of Dr. John W. Taylor, President of the University of Kentucky, as Deputy Director General of UNESCO was announced on November 8.

The fourth session of the International Civil Aviation Organization's Rules of the Air and Traffic Control Division (ICAO) opened in Montreal on November 14 to take up the matter of modernization of the World's Rules of the Air.

Contents

General Policy

The Shield of Faith. Address by Secretary Acheson	Page 799
The Liberty Bell—Symbol of Freedom. Address by the President	802
Prisoner of War Day Commemorated. Statement by Secretary Acheson	817

United Nations and Specialized Agencies

The Department of State and the United Nations. By Lincoln Palmer Bloomfield	804
United States Contribution to Improvement of World Health. By Willard L. Thorp	820
Uniting for Peace: Emergency Session of General Assembly—Peace Observation Commission—National Armed Forces Elements—Collective Measures Committee—Human Rights Be Respected—New Rules of Procedure	823
New Rule on Majority Vote for General Assembly Decisions	825
U.S. Attitude Concerning Yugoslav "Cease-Fire" Proposal. Statement by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.	826
U.N. Commission Conducts Survey in North Korean Area	829
Discussion of the Reelection of Trygve Lie as Secretary-General: Statement by Warren R. Austin	830
Resolution Continuing the Secretary-General in Office	831
Procedure To Admit Chinese Communists for U.N. Session. Statement by Warren R. Austin	831
Apology Before U.N. for U.S. Aircraft Violation of Frontier	832
The United States in the United Nations	834

Economic Affairs

Building Economic Strength. By Under Secretary James E. Webb	812
--	-----

Treaty Information

U.S. Attempts To Conclude U.S.S.R. Lend-Lease Program	817
Germany Asked To Consider Revival of Prewar Treaties	833

Technical Assistance

Soviet Claims Inquiry on Prisoners of War, a Propaganda Drive	817
U.S. Stand on Soviet Proposal for Big Four Session on Germany. Statement by Secretary Acheson	818
Mail Censorship by Soviets Violates German Constitution	818
Protest Delivered to U.S.S.R. for Interference in Austria	819
General Keyes Retires as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria	833

International Information and Cultural Affairs

Foreign Nationals Visit U.S.	822
--------------------------------------	-----

International Organizations and Conferences

Berlin Industrial Exhibition.	816
---------------------------------------	-----

The Congress

Legislation	833
-----------------------	-----

The Department

The Department of State and the United Nations. By Lincoln Palmer Bloomfield	804
Appointment of Officers	819

Publications

Recent Releases	811
---------------------------	-----

Contributors

Lincoln Palmer Bloomfield, author of the article on the Department of State and the United Nations, is staff assistant to the Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs.